

THE COMPOSITION
OF THE SAYINGS SOURCE

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

C.K. BARRETT, Durham - P. BORGES, Trondheim
J.K. ELLIOTT, Leeds - H.J. DE JONGE, Leiden
M.J.J. MENKEN, Utrecht - J. SMIT SIBINGA, Amsterdam

Executive Editors

A.J. MALHERBE, New Haven
D.P. MOESSNER, Atlanta

VOLUME XCI



THE COMPOSITION OF THE SAYINGS SOURCE

Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q

BY

ALAN KIRK



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
1998

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kirk, Alan (Alan K.)

The composition of the sayings source : genre, synchrony, and wisdom redaction in Q / by Alan Kirk.

p. cm. — (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ISSN 0167-9732 ; v. 91)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 9004110852 (alk. paper)

1. Q hypothesis (Synoptics criticism) I. Title. II. Series.

BS2555.2.K54 1998

226'.066—dc21

97-47633

CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Kirk, Alan:

The composition of the sayings source : genre, synchrony, and wisdom redaction in Q / by Alan Kirk. — Leiden ; Boston ; Köln :

Brill, 1998

(Supplements to Novum testamentum ; Vol. 91)

ISBN 90-04-11085-2

[Novum Testamentum / Supplements]

Supplements to Novum testamentum — Leiden ; New York ; Köln :

Brill

Früher Schriftenreihe

Fortlaufende Beiheftreihe zu Novum testamentum

Vol. 91. 1998

ISSN 0167-9732

ISBN 90 04 11085 2

© Copyright 1998 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	IX
Abbreviations	XI
I. Compositional Analysis of Q: History and Theory . . .	1
Compositional Analyses of Q in the History of	
Scholarship	2
Harnack.	2
Jülicher	3
Wellhausen	4
Bultmann	5
Streeter	10
Dibelius	10
Schulz.	11
Lührmann	14
Hoffmann.	16
Bammel	18
Polag	18
Schürmann	19
Zeller	24
Jacobson	27
Schmithals	31
Uro	32
Kloppenborg	34
Vaage	42
Boring, Kelber, Horsley.	44
Sato	49
Downing	53
Mack	55
Piper	61
Sevenich-Bax	62
Results and Considerations of Method.	64
Determining Genre.	75
Determining the Structure of Texts	78

II. Instructional Speech Compositions in Ancient Wisdom Literature	87
Defining Small Wisdom Forms	90
Egyptian Instructional Compositions	93
Instructional Compositions in Proverbs 1-9	100
Greco-Roman Instructional Compositions	104
Deliberative Rhetoric.	104
Chreia Elaboration.	109
<i>Lehrgedicht</i> , Gnomologium, Chreia Collection.	113
<i>Sentences of Sextus</i>	121
<i>Ad Demonium</i>	125
<i>Golden Verses</i> of Pythagoras	127
Hellenistic-Jewish Instructional Speeches	130
<i>Pseudo-Phocylides</i>	130
<i>Syriac Menander</i>	138
<i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	140
<i>Sirach</i>	143
Results	149
III. Instructional Speech Genre in Q	152
Instructional Speeches in Q	153
Love Your Enemies (6:27-35).	153
Judge Not (6:37-42)	165
Trees, Fruit, and Speech (6:43-45).	173
Confident Prayer (11:2-13)	176
Beelzebul Controversy (11:14-23).	183
Request for a Sign (11:29-35).	193
Courageous Witness (12:2-12).	203
Do Not Be Anxious (12:22-31, 33-34).	215
Be Watchful and Ready (12:35-46).	227
Discerning the Times (12:49, 51, 53-59).	235
Enter Through the Narrow Door (13:24-30; 14:11, 16-24, 26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35).	241
Discerning the Day of the Son of Man (17:23-37)	255
Results	268
IV. Macro-composition in Wisdom Literature and in Q	273
Macro-compositional Techniques in Ancient Wisdom Literature	274
Egyptian Instructions.	274

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VII

<i>Sirach</i>	275
<i>Pseudo-Phocylides</i>	277
<i>Golden Verses</i>	279
<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	282
Macro-compositions in Q	289
Eschatological Discourse (Q 12:2-22:30)	289
Controversy Discourse (Q 10:23-24; 11:2-13, 14-23, 24-26, 29-35, 39-52; 13:34-35)	309
Mission Instruction (Q 9:57-60; 10:2-16, 21-22)	336
Inaugural Discourse (Q 3:7-9, 16-17, 21-22; 4:1-13; 6:20b-49; 7:1-10, 18-35)	364
Summing Up	397
Bibliography	405
Indexes	435

PREFACE

The literature on the double tradition is vast. Any study proposing a comprehensive treatment of Q must solve the problem of intelligent selection from that literature or be overwhelmed. The requisite grid for the present analysis was provided by focusing attention on studies of Q which emphasize questions of formation, redaction-history, composition, and genre. However, redaction-history and genre-critical results inevitably have exegetical, theological, and christological ramifications. I have not hesitated to spell some of these out, though usually in a preliminary manner.

A similar problem arises with regard to primary sources adduced to construct heuristic models for comparative genre analysis. Such research into ancient literature can itself easily snowball to monograph proportions. I have sought to make the coverage of ancient sources extensive enough to generate good genre-critical models while remaining determined to keep in view the primary objective which is analysis of Q. With some exceptions I have pre-scinded from attempting "original" analyses of other wisdom and paraenetic texts, preferring wherever possible to make use of compositional and genre-critical studies by specialists in those texts.

Several acknowledgements are in order. My doctoral research at the University of Toronto (Center for the Study of Religion) was supported by a generous fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Professor John S. Kloppenborg encouraged pursuit of the thesis from its inception in his Q seminar and supervised it to completion. Professors Peter Richardson and Roger Beck put themselves at my disposal and willingly offered guidance whenever sought. The work in its present form owes a great deal to sage observations and astute criticisms made by members of my stellar examination committee. A post-doctoral fellowship from Research Services at the University of Calgary gave me time for fresh reflection, research, and writing. Professor Wayne McCready, head of the Department of Religious Studies at Calgary, created a wonderful environment in which to work during what was a very pleasant year.

Dr. David P. Moessner, senior editor of the *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* series, gave the manuscript expeditious attention.

Thanks are also owing to family and friends who encouraged and often helped a frequently impecunious graduate student family. Special acknowledgement is due to my father and mother, two of the finest, most courageous, most upright people in their community. Closest to my heart at all times are Sue, Andrew, and Jennie, to whom this work is dedicated.

ABBREVIATIONS

AASF	Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
<i>AmAnth</i>	<i>American Anthropologist</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
<i>AnLAb</i>	<i>Antike und Abendland</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW
BZNW	Beihefte zur ZNW
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>ClassQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
ConB	Coniectanea Biblica
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad novum testamentum
<i>CuRBS</i>	<i>Currents in Research: Biblical Studies</i>
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>Em</i>	<i>Emerita</i>
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
ETS	Erfurter theologische Studien
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>FZPhTh</i>	<i>Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie</i>
FzB	Forschung zur Bibel
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
<i>HB</i>	<i>Hibbert Journal</i>
<i>HistZeit</i>	<i>Historische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>HR</i>	<i>History of Religions</i>
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HSClPh</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
<i>ICSB</i>	<i>Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin</i>
<i>IQP</i>	<i>International Q Project</i>

<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JStJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSTNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LB</i>	<i>Linguistica Biblica</i>
<i>LCL</i>	Loeb Classical Library
<i>MThA</i>	Münsteraner theologische Abhandlungen
<i>Mus</i>	<i>Muséon</i>
<i>NLH</i>	<i>New Literary History</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTOA</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>NTAbh</i>	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
<i>OBO</i>	<i>Orbis biblicus et orientalis</i>
<i>OBT</i>	Overtures to Biblical Theology
<i>OTP</i>	Old Testament Pseudepigrapha
<i>PhilRhet</i>	<i>Philosophy and Rhetoric</i>
<i>PRE</i>	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopaedie der Classischen Alterthumswissenschaft</i>
<i>PCambPhS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</i>
<i>PTMS</i>	Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
<i>PWSup</i>	Supplement to Pauly-Wissowa
<i>QJS</i>	<i>Quarterly Journal of Speech</i>
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RelStRev</i>	<i>Religious Studies Review</i>
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>
<i>RGRW</i>	Religions in the Greco-Roman World
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>SBLDS</i>	SBL Dissertation Series
<i>SBLMS</i>	SBL Monograph Series
<i>SBLRBS</i>	SBL Resources for Biblical Study
<i>SBLSBS</i>	SBL Sources for Biblical Study
<i>SBLSP</i>	SBL Seminar Papers
<i>SBLTT</i>	SBL Texts and Translations
<i>SBS</i>	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
<i>SJLA</i>	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SNTU</i>	<i>Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt</i>
<i>SR/SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses</i>
<i>SO</i>	<i>Symbolae osloenses</i>
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
<i>STDJ</i>	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<i>TJT</i>	<i>Toronto Journal of Theology</i>
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
<i>TSAJ</i>	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
<i>TTZ</i>	<i>Trierer theologische Zeitschrift</i>

<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>WO</i>	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

CHAPTER ONE

COMPOSITIONAL ANALYSIS OF Q: HISTORY AND THEORY

Twentieth-century Q scholarship has been guided in large part by the analytical canons of classical form-criticism, which are in turn predicated upon *Kleinliteratur* conceptions of the origins of the synoptic traditions.¹ The inchoate, accretional growth of traditions posited by this approach made it inevitable that frequently the redaction history of Q would be tacitly or openly equated with tradition history. Correspondingly, it entailed that reconstruction of that history would depend on the analytical virtuosity of individual scholars aided by whatever social and theological histories of early Christianity might be viewed as apposite for retracing Q's formative trajectory. Because this approach by its nature has difficulties formulating consistent criteria which might arbitrate in cases of conflicting results, analysis of Q in the framework of the *Kleinliteratur* model of its origins has produced a number of redaction histories difficult to reconcile with one another.

The hegemony of the classical form-critical approach, which views Q as an epiphenomenon of the formation of the synoptic tradition in general, has been eroded in recent years by an increasing tendency to use genre criticism in redactional analyses of Q. This has been accompanied by a correlative willingness to question the soundness of the *Kleinliteratur* model, though *Kleinliteratur* conceptions are still overtly or residually operative even in some studies which assume a certain level of literary skill in the production of Q.² In this chapter we shall trace Q's tra-

¹ On the origins of the *Kleinliteratur* conception see below, note 25.

² Important genre-critical studies: James M. Robinson, "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q" in *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1964), 77-96; English translation "LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q," in James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 71-113; Ernst Bammel, "Das Ende von Q," in *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum*

jectory through twentieth-century scholarship, focusing upon works which explicitly or implicitly make global proposals with respect to the redaction of Q, with a view to plotting its emergence from analyses influenced by the *Kleinliteratur* model and examining its present status as increasingly the object of literary-critical studies, that is, analyses which view Q as a specimen of ancient literary genres. We shall conclude by outlining a methodology for genre and composition criticism to be applied in the analysis which follows.

Compositional Analyses of Q in the History of Scholarship

In general, synoptic scholarship before Harnack did not reflect deeply on compositional questions relating to Q. Scholars in the nineteenth century were more concerned with reconstructing Q's content and the original form of its wording.³ Though assuming its documentary status, they utilized Q mainly "as a convenient postulate which facilitated certain explanations of the Synoptic problem."⁴ A fresh point of departure for compositional analysis was Harnack's *The Sayings of Jesus* (1907), characterized by Kloppenborg and Vaage as a "threshold" in the study of Q.⁵

Harnack

Harnack posited Q as a text with distinct compositional contours and, accordingly, questioned the notion that it was "a merely formless compilation of sayings and discourses...without any thread of connection."⁶ He suggested that Q is framed by material

70. *Geburtstag*, eds. O. Böcher und K. Haacker (Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970), 39-50; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, Studies in Antiquity and Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); Migaku Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, WUNT 2.29 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1988).

³ Wilhelm Bussmann, *Synoptische Studien. 2 Heft. Zur Redenquelle* (Halle [Saale]: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1929), 10-21.

⁴ John S. Kloppenborg and Leif E. Vaage, "Early Christianity, Q and Jesus: The Sayings Gospel and Method in the Study of Christian Origins," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia 55*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg, collab. Leif E. Vaage (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 1-14, esp. 2-3.

⁵ Kloppenborg and Vaage, "Early Christianity," 3.

⁶ Adolf von Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew*

describing the beginning of Jesus' ministry (3:7-9, 16-17, 21-22; 4:1-13) and by discourses announcing judgment and Jesus' parousia (13:34-35; 12:39-46; 17:23-37). Between this framework lies a "compilation" of Jesus' teaching (Λόγοι Ἰησοῦ) arranged in groups according to subject matter but unconnected by any chronological or narrative thread.⁷ However, Harnack argued on the basis of the common sequence attested by the double tradition that "this source had an order which in essential points is natural and intelligible."⁸ Harnack also appealed to thematic appropriateness of juxtapositions and posited, for example, a Q order of 11:46-52 (Woes Against Pharisees), 13:34-35 (Announcement of Judgment over Jerusalem), 17:23-37 (Announcement of Parousia), 12:39-46 (Coming Like a Thief), since these "are correctly given in juxtaposition" (in Harnack's view, by Matthew). According to Harnack, Q did not have a complex compositional history; rather, it was theologically and stylistically homogeneous, containing as it did the unfiltered message of Jesus.⁹

Jülicher

In his 1904 *Introduction to the New Testament*, Jülicher described Q as "a collection of the sayings of Jesus, composed without any exercise of conscious art," though he conceded that the sayings may have some "internal connection between them."¹⁰ In Jülicher's view, Q is not susceptible of reconstruction in either plan or extent, though a thematic clustering of sayings with catechetical intent is detectable.¹¹ In the seventh German edition of the *Einleitung* (1931), the form-critical perspective has come to dominate. Jülicher repeats his opinion that Q is an artless collection of Jesus' sayings grouped thematically with a view to catechetical use and that "Umfang und Anlage bleiben dunkel."¹² But now

and *St. Luke*, trans. J. R. Wilkinson, *New Testament Studies* 2 (London: Williams & Norgate; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), 181.

⁷ Harnack, *Sayings*, 177-78, 228, 235-36.

⁸ Harnack, *Sayings*, 178.

⁹ Harnack, *Sayings*, 162-63, 167-68, 251.

¹⁰ Adolf Jülicher, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. Janet Penrose Ward (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1904), 356.

¹¹ Jülicher, *Introduction*, 358.

¹² Adolf Jülicher with Erich Fascher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 7th ed. (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1931), 339.

he adds that Q is "ein nebelhaftes Gebilde....in mündlicher Tradition wachsenden Schicht" which has moved through several fluid developmental stages beginning from individual pieces of tradition. To support this conception Jülicher argues that Q has material both earlier and later than Mark, that the mixing of narrative and sayings in the final form of Q is a post-Markan form-critical development, and that Q shows material both influenced and uninfluenced by Mark, all of which, especially the latter, are in his view diachronic indicators. This view of Q's formation reflects the tendency of classical form criticism to assimilate the literary history of Q to its view of the history of the synoptic tradition, in effect dissolving Q into the diachronic flow of that history.

Wellhausen

Wellhausen is important for the history of Q scholarship not least for his influence upon Bultmann, who gives him credit for perceiving the large extent to which early community theology is implicated in the production of Q.¹³ Perhaps because of his pre-form-critical perspective, Wellhausen does not view Q as an expanding body of tradition, other than to suggest that in its present form Q is the product of expansions from kernels of primitive Jesus-material carried out by the charismatic Jerusalem community, allowing also that "vielleicht ist sie auch in späteren Ausgaben über ihre Urgestalt hinaus gewachsen."¹⁴ Like Jülicher Wellhausen views Q as a catechetical document and like Harnack proposes a framework consisting of John's and Jesus' opening and closing (respectively) eschatological speeches.¹⁵ In contrast to Jülicher, Wellhausen argues that the Q materials are placed in a well-integrated whole, are "schriftstellerische Kompositionen," have "im Großen wie im Kleinen eine kunstmäßige und literarische Form," whose "Zusammenhang ist gleichartig und

¹³ Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, rev. ed., trans. John Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968), 2; idem, "The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem," *JR* 6 (1926) 337-62, esp. 340-41.

¹⁴ Julius Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1911), 163; see also 168-69.

¹⁵ Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, 171.

wohl geordnet, kein Gemisch von unverdauten Brocken."¹⁶ Elsewhere, however, Wellhausen seems less enthusiastic about the smoothness of Q's internal composition, for example, seeing tension in the juxtaposition of the Beelzebul controversy (11:14-23) with the Returning Spirit (11:24-26) and the Request for a Sign (11:29ff.).¹⁷

*Bultmann*¹⁸

Though Bultmann did not devote a great deal of attention to Q as text, he provided the conceptual lens through which he and the majority of Q scholars following him, even down to the present, were to view its formative history. Bultmann's programmatic perspectives on Q can be set out as follows:

(1) *Q a community product*: The title as well as the substance of his early essay, "What the Sayings Source Reveals About the Early Church," indicates that for Bultmann Q functioned primarily as a window through which one might view the early community's development and then behind the community (more obscurely) Jesus' preaching.¹⁹ He states in another essay:

So far as the *Logia* are concerned, this means that they are a primary source from which we can reconstruct a picture of the primitive community in which the *Logia* arose. Only after we have

¹⁶ Wellhausen, *Einleitung*, 161-62 and 75 respectively. Wellhausen compares Q's fine composition favorably with Mark's allegedly more primitive style, and thus his view of Q composition is linked to his endeavor to show that Mark is more primitive than Q.

¹⁷ "Beides stimmt in Wahrheit schlecht zu der Beelzebulsperikope, in der Jesus vielmehr auf seine Exorzismen Gewicht legt" (*Einleitung*, 67).

¹⁸ We pass over some British exegetes who lie between Wellhausen and Bultmann, or are contemporaneous with the latter, but who made little lasting impact upon subsequent Q research: Charles Willoughby Allen, "The Book of Sayings Used by the Editor of the First Gospel," in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1911), 235-86; James Moffat, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd. rev. ed. (Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1918), 194-202; B. W. Bacon, "The Nature and Design of Q, the Second Synoptic Source," *HJ* 22 (1924) 674-88 (an early attempt to propose a theological profile for Q).

¹⁹ Rudolf Bultmann, "What the Sayings Source Reveals About the Early Church," in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*, ed. and trans. John S. Kloppenborg (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 23-34, esp. 25, first published in 1913.

obtained such a historical picture of the community are we in a position to reconstruct the picture of Jesus and his preaching.²⁰

Framing the question of Q's formation diachronically in terms of tradition history and corresponding community development reflected the project of classical form-criticism, a project predicated upon hope of access to the oral pre-history of the text.²¹ To the extent that Bultmann's research agenda became programmatic for subsequent generations of scholars, Q as (possibly) a literary artifact and accordingly a potential object for literary analysis virtually disappeared from view.²² Joachim Rohde states that "form criticism relaxed the literary rigidity of the sources, so that...they were understood as strata rather than as compositions."²³ Emphasis upon a developing, anonymous community responsible for the production and transmission of the traditions sedimentized in the early texts inevitably entailed the diminishing (if not outright eclipse) of the figure of the redactor.²⁴

(2) *Q an expanding body of tradition*: Bultmann in effect dissolved Q into the flux of the developing synoptic tradition. This was not the result of benign neglect of literary approaches to Q; rather, Bultmann repudiated the notion that Q might find terms of comparison among antique literary genres, driving a wedge between literature proper and the forms proposed for the developing synoptic tradition, which were more like "popular" or *Kleinliteratur*, that is, non- or less literate forms of expression indigenous to the oral life of the primitive community.²⁵ Literary genres

²⁰ Bultmann, "New Approach," 341.

²¹ Klaus Berger, *Einführung in die Formgeschichte*, UTB 1444 (Tübingen: Francke, 1987), 87, 89; Gerhard Sellin, "'Gattung' und 'Sitz im Leben' auf dem Hintergrund der Problematik von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit synoptischer Erzählungen," *EvT* 50 (1990) 311-31, esp. 312.

²² Kloppenborg and Vaage, "Early Christianity," 5.

²³ Joachim Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*, new ed., trans. Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM, 1968), 4.

²⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 4; Klaus Berger, "Form und Gattungsgeschichte," in *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe*, (Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln: W. Kohlhammer, 1990), 2.430-45, esp. 437-38; Werner Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 3.

²⁵ See Bultmann, *History*, 4, 321-22, who allows for some influence from genres of Jewish literature, such as apocalypse (368). This conception of early Christian literature can be traced to Franz Overbeck, "Über die Anfänge der

exerted formative influence only after the synoptic tradition had undergone a period of expansion in the oralized, enthusiastic environment of early Christian communities. In this primitive context traditions were preserved using the putative oral techniques of concatenations of small units on the basis of catchword, formal similarity, or even chance, growing in the course of time to resemble speeches without benefit of special compositional intervention.²⁶ That Bultmann assimilates Q to this process is clear from his analyses of Q materials. For example, he speaks of "serializing the dominical sayings without reference to their contexts."²⁷ The Q material in 7:18-35 was collected together because the individual units all make some reference to John (catchword).²⁸ Likewise Q 11:33-36 was clustered "simply" by the catchword *λύχνος*.²⁹ Juxtaposed double parables such as the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin (Q:15:4-10) are the result of natural accretion whereby a second parable is formed on analogy with the primary one.³⁰ Larger clusters such as the Beelzebul Controversy (Q 11:14-23) and the Demand for a Sign (Q 11:29ff.) "are neighboring items without connection."³¹ The compositional model corresponding to this view of the formation of Q materials is aptly described by Kelber as "a process of aggregate growth."³² Q for Bultmann was a screen on which he projected his conception of the development of the synoptic tradition: "In

patristischen Literatur," *HistZeit* 48 (1882) 417-72, esp. 428-29, 431, 443-44, 447-52, and behind him to Herder. Overbeck posited an "Urliteratur" developing before the primitive Christian community's "Vermischung mit der sie umgebenden Welt" (443) and the corresponding assimilation of that profane world's sophisticated literary genres. For analysis and critique of the *Kleinliteratur* conception see Berger, "Form und Gattungsgeschichte," 439-40, idem, *Einführung*, 63-64, 68-69, 203-206, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 3-8, Sellin, "'Gattung,'" 313-14 (who notes that Overbeck's "Urliteratur" and the Christian *Urgemeinde* supplied the form-critics with a working analogy to Gunkel's oral *Urzeit* for Israel), and Detlev Dormeyer, *Das Neue Testament im Rahmen der Antiken Literaturgeschichte: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993), 1-11.

²⁶ Bultmann, *History*, 321-22; Kelber, *Oral and Written*, 7; idem, "From Aphorism to Sayings Gospel and from Parable to Narrative Gospel," *Forum* 1/1 (1985) 23-30, esp. 26.

²⁷ Bultmann, *History*, 322.

²⁸ Bultmann, *History*, 323.

²⁹ Bultmann, *History*, 326.

³⁰ Bultmann, *History*, 194.

³¹ Bultmann, *History*, 62.

³² Kelber, *Oral and Written*, 4.

his view...Q was best regarded as a growing body of tradition."³³ This view has pervaded Q scholarship ever since.

Bultmann makes, however, a briefly stated but crucial concession, allowing "some sort of conceptual development" to explain obvious traces of elaborations developing along the length of larger sayings groups.³⁴ He thus opens the door a crack for reflective human activity in the genesis of such groups. Some of Bultmann's successors (especially Schürmann and those influenced by him) have attempted to eliminate this aporia in his thought, which posits reflective composition alongside agglutinative growth, by importing reflective redaction back into each of the manifold stages of development from the juxtaposition of single sayings to the generation of complex speeches.

(3) *Q formed diachronically*: The consequence of making Q an expanding body of tradition and a witness to community development was to ensure the dominance of a particular diachronic perspective in subsequent Q research. Bultmann articulated this diachronic approach, which was programmatic for classical form criticism, as follows: "If we define the total undertaking as that of distinguishing the different stages of the synoptic tradition from one another in order to identify the oldest, the very first task is to make a critical distinction between tradition and editorial redaction in the Synoptic Gospels" (my emphasis).³⁵ Diachronic understandings of Q's formation, pervasive in Q research past and present, can be seen as descendants of Bultmann's model for Q which assimilated it to his reconstruction of the history of the synoptic tradition. This critical re-visiting of Bultmann's model does not entail the rejection of stratigraphical theories of Q *per se* (which would be a textbook example of the genealogical fallacy), particularly if such are able to appeal to literary-critical arguments independently of Bultmann's conceptual apparatus. Nevertheless, given the genealogical connection *in general* of many such theories to the analytical canons of classical form-criticism, the impression of a current "consensus" that Q is a layered document loses some of its probative force.³⁶

³³ John S. Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaction in the Synoptic Sayings Source," *CBQ* 46 (1984) 434-62, esp. 36.

³⁴ Bultmann, *History*, 322.

³⁵ Bultmann, "New Approach," 342; see also *idem*, *History*, 6.

³⁶ See John S. Kloppenborg, preface to *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, vii.

(4) *Diminished role for Q's final redactor*: Bultmann limited the contribution of the final redactor of Q to "only some enumerations and summings up," the end result of which was not to produce anything resembling an integrated text.³⁷ In other words, Q presents itself to the analyst as an outcrop of easily accessible strata of tradition (given the application of proper techniques). Bultmann's final redactor was primarily a *tradent* who only lightly inscribed his or her presence and did not come close to digesting or even understanding the traditions. "Much will be included [by the redactor] despite the fact that it does not accord with the tendencies of the writer. Much will be transmitted without reflection or understanding, and it would obviously be incorrect to use such material for understanding the character of the writer."³⁸ *Difference* thus characterizes Bultmann's view of Q; for him "Q" is a cipher for a collection of uneasily co-existing traditions lightly overlaid by redaction. The analytical operations to be performed are to distinguish tradition from redaction and then layers of tradition on the basis of coherence. Investigation of the text's final form—in short, the contribution of the final redactor—is allotted just a modest amount of space under such a research regime. This adumbration of Bultmann's views on Q redaction should not, however, be taken as implying that such a model of redaction is in itself impossible; the point rather is to draw attention to the tendency to project this model, which fits well with certain views of the nature of the primitive Christian communities, upon Q.

Bultmann's conception of Q continues to be influential in many analyses, despite the fact that it has been revised by some scholars and even on occasion received some serious challenges. The programmatic distinction between tradition and redaction, the belief that Q is an expanding body of tradition produced by a developing community, and the accompanying diachronic perspective virtually pre-ordain stratigraphical outcomes which by definition tend to pay little if any attention to the present form of the text.

³⁷ Bultmann, *History*, 368.

³⁸ Bultmann, "Sayings Source," 24.

Streeter

B. H. Streeter suggested two genre designations for Q: (1) "Wise Sayings" of Christ comparable to a book like Proverbs or the *Pirge Aboth*," and (2) a "prophetic book like Jeremiah," while also assuming that it had a catechetical function.³⁹ Other than suggesting that the Baptism and Temptation function as a prophetic call, Streeter did not use these tentative genre designations heuristically, ultimately taking Q to be a "collection of disconnected sayings."⁴⁰ Despite this denial of any significant internal arrangement in Q, Streeter suggested that John's Preaching, the Baptism, and the Temptation formed a section, that the Baptism functioned as a hinge between the other two, and, appealing to the *Didache*, that the natural place for the Q "apocalypse" (17:23-37) and the Parable of the Pounds (19:11-27) was the end of the document.⁴¹ In short, Streeter really had no integrated view of the compositional form of Q. As it is, the main lines of research with respect to the formation of Q were being laid down by Bultmann and Dibelius.

Dibelius

Dibelius was one with Bultmann in driving a wedge between gospel traditions and "high" literature and in repudiating a methodology which might look to the literature of antiquity in a thoroughgoing manner for terms of comparison; rather, analysis was to be directed internally to the material.⁴² Dibelius' final Q-redactor disappeared even more irretrievably than Bultmann's; for Dibelius, Q virtually emanated from the life of the primitive community.⁴³ So assimilated was it to the life of the community and lacking in editorial mediation that Dibelius was reluctant even to

³⁹ B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: MacMillan, 1924), 286, 291-92.

⁴⁰ B. H. Streeter, "The Original Extent of Q," *Oxford Studies*, 185-208, esp. 201; idem, *Four Gospels*, 286.

⁴¹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 188, 287-88.

⁴² Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. B. L. Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), 1-9.

⁴³ Dibelius, *Tradition to Gospel*, 8. Kloppenborg notes that *Kleinliteratur* was taken to be "the immediate expression of the practical interests of the primitive church..." (*Formation*, 4).

designate Q—"sayings without context"—a concrete entity, though he allowed that this nebulous stratum served paraenetic ends.⁴⁴ Like Bultmann, Dibelius viewed Q as a diachronic record of the history of the developing tradition. Later layers overlaid earlier ones without obscuring the "original character" of the latter, so for Dibelius redactional work had no integrative effect on the whole. For example, he designates Q 4:1-13; 10:21-22; 11:49-52; and 13:34-35 as Christological "retrospective" additions which "have not been able to obscure the original character of this collection of the words of Jesus."⁴⁵ The implications of this conceptual framework for Q research, in tandem with Bultmann's similar though less extreme views, were far-reaching. The effect of embedding Q's formation almost axiomatically in the *Kleinliteratur* theory (with its ancillary social history of primitive Christianity) was to preclude at the outset literary-critical approaches to Q in the context of comparison with ancient genres.⁴⁶

Schulz⁴⁷

Siegfried Schulz's commentary on Q merges redaction history into tradition history. Schulz states programmatically: "Im folgenden geht es zunächst um die Rekonstruktion der hinter der Q-Quelle liegenden Geschichte der Überlieferung, um die traditionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Q."⁴⁸ The most decisive of Schulz's criteria for separation of layers in Q is a social and theological

⁴⁴ Dibelius, *Tradition to Gospel*, 234-35, 244-45, 289. H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM, 1965), 242, accepts Dibelius' characterization of Q (234-35), though he departs from Dibelius by assuming that the "stratum of tradition" had a logical plan of arrangement (242-43, 247, referring to Manson). Logical arrangement notwithstanding, Tödt does not concede the existence of "a distinguished individual person who compiled the sayings" (244).

⁴⁵ Dibelius, *Tradition to Gospel*, 245-46.

⁴⁶ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 39.

⁴⁷ T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1949), first published as Part II of *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1937), argued that the present form of Q has an intelligible, sophisticated internal arrangement. While *Sayings of Jesus* is consulted regularly for its commentary value, Manson's theories of Q's composition have had little influence because he did not engage significantly with the work of the form critics.

⁴⁸ Siegfried Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 44. For analysis see Ulrich Luz, "Die wiederentdeckte Logienquelle," *EvT* 33 (1973) 527-33, esp. 531.

history which plots the development of early Christianity on a trajectory moving from a Palestinian to a Hellenistic-Jewish cultural environment.⁴⁹ Schulz defines his task as the resolution of Q traditions into layers which correspond to this bipartite social history. Detection of compositional relationships established by the present juxtaposition of materials is “ohne Belang”; in fact, materials from allegedly different tradition-history layers, even when juxtaposed (as in the case of Q 11:39-48 and 11:49-51), should not (“auf keinen Fall”) be viewed or interpreted together.⁵⁰ In accordance with the conceptual debt he owes to Bultmann, Schulz equates the formation of Q with the expansion of a body of tradition which grew by agglutination as its trajectory passed through these two cultural spheres. Only in the Hellenistic-Jewish community—at the end of this agglutinative trajectory—does a redaction of the tradition take place.⁵¹ Schulz does not explain what textual status this aggregated body of tradition might have had prior to this redaction, preferring rather to speak ambiguously of a “Prozeß der Verschriftung.”⁵² He appears to attribute to the material in the oldest stratum a semi-oralized existence, emanating as it did from the charged atmosphere of prophetic enthusiasm allegedly characteristic of the primitive Palestinian

⁴⁹ Schulz defines a primitive Palestinian layer using a mix of form-critical, theological, and social-history criteria such as evidence of prophetic enthusiasm, near-expectation, exalted Son of Man Christology, *Torawerschöpfung*, and the prophetic introduction formula λέγω ὑμῖν. The younger Hellenistic-Jewish layer is distinguishable by its use of the LXX, wisdom and Son of God motifs, expanded apophthegms, delay of parousia, *heilsgeschichtliche* periodization, polemic against Israel, and the earthly Jesus interpreted kerygmatically (*Spruchquelle*, 43-53).

⁵⁰ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 339, 348. Schulz goes so far as to assert it is not important “ob diese Komposition auf eine nach Sachordnung vorgegebene Sammlung oder auf bewußte Arbeit der Q-Redaktion zurückgeht” (339). He acknowledges, however, that the more general “Q-Kontext” has relevance (348).

⁵¹ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 42, 216, 486.

⁵² Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 57. John S. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems,” forthcoming in *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. Risto Uro, Suomen Eksegetischen Seuran Julkaisuja, Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 63 (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), cited in typescript, 22, states, “It is unclear whether Schulz would adopt a ‘precipitation’ or ‘aggregation’ model for the composition of either or both of his strata. Only infrequently does he mention the ‘final Q redactors’ (p. 481) or the ‘Gentile-Christian final redactor’ (p. 484) and even then does not indicate how they functioned.”

community. Consistently with this view of Q's formation, Schulz rejects literary-critical comparison with other literature for either layer.⁵³ As for Bultmann, for Schulz Q is a cipher for the history of the synoptic tradition in general. Accordingly, Q becomes a screen on which his social history of early Christianity can be projected, though it should be kept in mind that this occurs frequently in Q scholarship.⁵⁴ Viewing Q as an amorphous body of expanding tradition enables critics to project a given social and/or theological history of early Christianity onto it by configuring the redaction history of the text in a corresponding manner, thereby creating the illusion that Q's formative history supports the postulated theological/social history.

Criticism of Schulz's tradition-history approach has centered largely around pointing out that Schulz does virtually no literary analysis *per se*, but, as noted, sorts Q materials into privileged tradition-history categories.⁵⁵ However, his methodology is intelligible given his assumptions (widely shared) about the aggregative history of the synoptic tradition and its enthusiastic, literarily-naïve tradents. Similarly, the tendency to equate redaction history with tradition history is a direct consequence of this approach, an equation which is untenable, however, because of the manifest fact that a single editorial act is capable of bringing together in synchronic relationship materials both primitive and late from a tradition-history perspective. This means that compositional

⁵³ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 57.

⁵⁴ For example, the following analysis: "Das Credo zum irdischen Jesus gehörte nicht zum ältesten Urchristentum, weil das gegenwärtige Wirken des Erhöhten und die apokalyptische Erwartung seiner Ankunft in allernächster Nähe das Denken und Leben der ältesten Q-Gemeinde in alles beherrschender Weise bestimmten. Erst in den jüngeren Q-Stoffen wird das Erdenwerden Jesu kerygmatisch qualifiziert. Die ältesten Q-Stoffe hingegen kennen keinen kerygmatischen Rückgriff auf den historischen Jesus, keine eschatologische Funktion der Historie und keine Historisierung" (*Spruchquelle*, 61).

⁵⁵ See Frans Neirynck, "Recent Developments in the Study of Q," in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus — The Sayings of Jesus*, ed. Joël Delobel, BETL 59 (Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1982), 29-75, esp. 40. Kloppenborg, "Literary and Stratigraphic Problems," 22, Volker Schönle, *Johannes, Jesus and die Juden. Die theologische Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt. 11*, BET 17 (Frankfurt am Main, Bern: Peter Lang, 1982), 23, and Heinz Schürmann, "Zur Kompositionsgeschichte der Redenquelle. Beobachtungen an der lukanischen Q-Vorlage," in *Der Treue Gottes Trauen: Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas*, eds. Claus Bussmann and Walter Radl (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1991), 325-42, esp. 340, note 109.

analysis must in principle appeal to analytical criteria different from those used to recover tradition histories.⁵⁶

Lührmann

Lührmann's work marks a major advance in Q scholarship, for it moves the act of redaction to the center of the field of vision and gives it the decisive role in the formation of Q. In other words, *Lührmann gives the reflective literary activity necessary for the creation of intelligible texts its due*. In this respect he is the first Q scholar of recent decades to reconstitute Q as a literary text, initiating a reversal of classical form criticism's dissolution of Q into the aggregative developmental stream of the synoptic tradition. His work has produced enduring results, in particular, recognition of the role in Q redaction played by negative evaluations of "this generation" and by the corresponding "announcement of judgment."⁵⁷

In important respects, however, Lührmann's model for the formation of Q still provides a vehicle for older views influenced by the *Kleinliteratur* conception. Lührmann continues to make the classic distinction between *Sammlung* and *Redaktion*. Lührmann's *Sammlung* designates the developmental processes of the synoptic tradition envisioned by classical form criticism. It is a body of tradition which has "zusammengewachsen" into larger units from smaller ones over a period of time under the auspices of the primitive community, was "unter Stichwort- und Sachdisposition zusammengefaßt," and in distinction from the *Redaktion* was subject to no "bewußte Gestaltung" but was "einfache Übernahme eines Stoffes."⁵⁸ Like the classical form critics, Lührmann makes virtually no comparisons with ancient literature, other than to note that concluding a text with eschatological material is "eine

⁵⁶ See Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaction," 42, 45, Daniel Kosch, *Die Eschatologische Tora des Menschensohnes: Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Stellung Jesu zur Tora in Q*, NTOA 12 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 44, and Arland D. Jacobson, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1992), 43.

⁵⁷ See John S. Kloppenborg, introduction to *The Shape of Q*, 1-22, esp. 16, and idem, "Tradition and Redaction," 49.

⁵⁸ Dieter Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*, WMANT 33 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 55, 84-85; idem, "Liebet eure Feinde (Lk 6,27-36/Mt 5,39-48)," *ZTK* 69 (1972) 412-38, esp. 423, note 44, 432.

auch sonst in jüdischer und urchristlicher Literatur typische Erscheinung."⁵⁹

In itself there is nothing problematic with such a starting point, since what is decisive for the formation of Q is redaction of traditions, not their history. However, while Lührmann in principle acknowledges that redactional interventions have a hermeneutical effect on the entire text, his posited Q redaction does not digest all of this tradition, leaving a mixed text of partially integrated *Sammlung* and *Redaktion*, which raises questions about the intelligibility of the resulting text. His redactor is responsible for the formation of Q as a document with a distinct redactional profile, yet still bears a family resemblance to Bultmann's redactor whose touch is so light that the rough edges of the aggregated tradition show through in an easily detectable manner. Paul Hoffmann states that Lührmann "trägt aber dabei der Tatsache zu wenig Rechnung, daß die Aufnahme der Tradition durch die Redaktion ein besonderes Verhältnis des Redaktors zu dieser Tradition voraussetzt," to which Lührmann responds that he assumes a middle position between the alternatives "Identifikation oder Distanzierung" with regard to the relationship of the redactor to the material.⁶⁰

Furthermore, Lührmann has difficulty maintaining his characterization of the *Sammlung* as not having been subjected to "bewußte Gestaltung," for he assumes elsewhere that it contains a formative ("gestaltende") anti-Baptist and anti-Pharisaic polemic altered by the redactor to a polemic against "this generation."⁶¹ This in turn raises the question as to whether Lührmann's formative redaction really differs in kind from the formative tendencies he acknowledges to be operative in the tradition, and thus it is not clear that his model differs from the classical form-critical version of Q's genesis in which a final redactor merely puts an end to a long process of tradition-formation.

⁵⁹ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 90.

⁶⁰ Paul Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*, 2nd. ed., NTAbh 2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1972), 3; Lührmann, "Liebet," 423, note 44; see also Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaktion," 49.

⁶¹ *Redaktion*, 86; "Liebet," 423. Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 40, notes this vacillation and for a solution posits earlier redactions. Schönle, *Johannes, Jesus*, 22, questions whether the notion of "unbewußte Sammlung" even qualifies as a coherent concept.

However, another crucial area where Lührmann moves beyond his predecessors, with their limitation to tradition-history or thematic analysis, is his search for literary-critical criteria—compositional criteria such as the order and juxtaposition of sayings—to back up his analysis of the tendencies of the tradition and the redaction, and his application of these criteria to analysis of large sections of text. Lührmann's major literary-critical control is to proceed dialectically by examining the textual distribution of a promising motif constellation, in this case, the announcement of judgment and polemic against "this generation." If sayings embodying these motifs appear inserted at key points across more than one complex of sayings, the motif constellation in question likely reflects the interests of the redactor, in effect establishing coherence at the macro level of the text.⁶² This initiative to implement literary controls is, as Kloppenborg notes, one of the most important advances in Q research.⁶³ However, probably because Lührmann views Q as collection + redaction, and thus compositionally primitive, his literary-critical instrument is quite blunt, limited to delineating thematic complexes and insertions into large complexes of sayings. Other than comparison with Mark, Lührmann's literary-critical analysis is based upon internal appraisal of Q's text—a coherent procedure if Q is viewed as unrelated to other ancient texts. Ancient literary genres, which might deliver information about compositional conventions possibly operative in Q, are not a factor in the analysis.

Hoffmann

Paul Hoffmann is an early advocate of the view that the Q redactor appropriated (or was appropriated by) the tradition in a much more thoroughgoing way than previous critics allowed.⁶⁴ Hoffmann urges viewing the Q redactor's activity as a *relecture* or new interpretation of the tradition. Moreover, he argues that it is possible to move beyond "Einzellogien" to detect "Logienkompositionen" formed under the impetus of consistent theolog-

⁶² Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 19-22, 93

⁶³ Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaction," 49.

⁶⁴ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 3.

ical interests. Starting from these principles, Hoffmann believes it is possible to read the Q text as it is under the rubric of unifying theological tendencies: "Die in ihnen [extended complexes] gesammelten Logien sind nicht nur unter mnemotechnischem Gesichtspunkt gesammelt, sondern sie wurden einer umfassenderen theologischen Konzeption eingeordnet und von ihr her neu ausgelegt."⁶⁵ While rejecting a Q bifurcated along tradition/redaction lines, Hoffmann nevertheless believes that redaction-history studies are possible on a case by case basis and produces sophisticated analyses along those lines.⁶⁶

Hoffmann's proposal that all levels of the tradition were conditioned by the theological reflection of the Q redactor represents a departure from classical form criticism's tendency to make the final redactor somewhat of an addendum. Like Lührmann, Hoffmann looks for a constellation of related motifs across the expanse of Q's text which can be taken as an indicator of the theological interests of the redaction and finds this in a Son of Man Christology, postulating an older "prophetische-weisheitliche" layer worked over by the Son of Man conception.⁶⁷ Despite his assertion of pervasive theological interests operative in the composition of sayings-clusters, Hoffmann's literary-critical analysis operates, like Lührmann's, at a quite general level, perhaps because of *Kleinliteratur* assumptions.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 2-4.

⁶⁶ See, for example, Paul Hoffmann, "Jesu 'Verbot des Sorgens' und seine Nachgeschichte in der synoptischen Überlieferung," in *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum: Beiträge zur Verkündigung Jesu und zum Kerygma der Kirche*, eds. Dietrich-Alex Koch, Gerhard Sellin und Andreas Lindemann (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1989), 116-41. Here Hoffmann seeks through redaction-critical operations to separate Jesus' primitive message from its reception and redaction in Q 12:22-31.

⁶⁷ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 230-32.

⁶⁸ "Ich...sehe auch die Frage als zweitrangig an, ob es sich um eine schriftliche Quelle oder—wie es die Übereinstimmungen zumindest fordern—um eine sehr feste Überlieferungsschicht handelt" (*Studien*, 1-2). Richard A. Edwards likewise proposes reading the final form of Q under a unified theological perspective while downplaying the connection of this operation with considerations of literary *Gestalt* (*A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy, and Wisdom* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976], 23-24).

Bammel

In his statement, "Q ist als ein schriftstellerisches Gebilde anzusehen, das der Form der Testamente ähnelt, um zum Schluß [22:28-30] in eben diese Form einzumünden,"⁶⁹ Bammel shows himself ahead of his time in his conception of Q as an authorial composition, his comparative foray into ancient literature, and his concern to interpret individual Q units in the context of an overarching genre. Bammel's proposal that Q is a Testament has not survived criticism: his proposal rests upon too small a basis—essentially appealing to 22:28-30 (the Q status of verses 28-29 is itself questionable)—and thus is unable to show that Testament constitutes the framework genre of the entire document. In a later publication he appears to abandon the Testament genre in favor of a "Spruchbuch" designation.⁷⁰

Polag

Polag works out a redaction history of Q within the classical form-critical conceptual framework of an expanding tradition finally arrested by an ultimate—in Polag's case penultimate—redaction. He states programmatically: "Als Sammlung von Herrenworten hat Q einen längeren Überlieferungsprozeß durchlaufen. Für uns einigermaßen faßbar ist dasjenige Stadium, das

⁶⁹ Ernst Bammel, "Das Ende vom Q" in *Verborum Veritas*, 39-50, esp. 49.

⁷⁰ Ernst Bammel, "Der Anfang des Spruchbuches," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, ed. Camille Focant, BETL 110 (Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993), 467-75. For criticism see John S. Kloppenborg, "City and Wasteland: Narrative World and the Beginning of the Sayings Gospel (Q)," in *How Gospels Begin = Semeia* 52, ed. Dennis E. Smith (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 145-60, esp. 147, idem, introduction to *Shape of Q*, 13, and James M. Robinson, "On Bridging the Gulf from Q to the Gospel of Thomas (or vice versa)," in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*, eds. Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson Jr. (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1985), 127-75, esp. 164. John J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, eds. Leo G. Perdue, Bernard Brandon Scott, and William Johnston Wiseman (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 165-85, points out that the typical pattern of a Testament is "(1) the patriarch addresses his sons; (2) he recalls an episode from his life; (3) he delivers an extended ethical exhortation; (4) there is a prediction, with an eschatological dimension; and (5) the testament concludes with the death and burial of the patriarch" (178).

den Vorlagen des Mt und Lk zuletzt gemeinsam war. Für diese Stufe ist eine bewußte Redaktion und die Schriftlichkeit der Überlieferung anzunehmen."⁷¹ The process unfolds as follows: (1) individual sayings of Jesus; (2) formation of "kleiner Spruchgruppen (meist nach mnemotechnischen Gesichtspunkten)"; (3) collection into a "Hauptsammlung," which was also a redaction of its constituent small units; (4) a "späte Redaktion" responsible for the present form of Q.⁷² Because "die Redaktion der Hauptsammlung in Q setzt bereits einen längeren Überlieferungsvorgang voraus; es ist daher angemessen, Redaktion und Tradition zu unterscheiden."⁷³ The tradents "have barely edited the texts" and "Q is not a great literary achievement."⁷⁴

Polag relies heavily upon alleged shifts in christology and certain views of the changing activities of the early community to distinguish proposed strata.⁷⁵ Because his analytical scheme inclines toward correlating higher christology with later stages of development, units within Q such as 10:21-22 which exhibit high christological reflection are placed into a late redaction. Units which show christological reflection of a middling sort (Wisdom, Son of Man) are placed into the penultimate redaction, whereas the view of Jesus as "das endgültige Heilshandlung Gottes an seinem Volk....heilsentscheidende Funktion" makes the impress upon the early collections.⁷⁶ Polag's construal is plausible, but it must take its place alongside other equally plausible redaction histories which appeal to a different set of categories.

Schürmann

Heinz Schürmann has produced an influential account of the for-

⁷¹ Athanasius Polag, *Die Christologie der Logienquelle*, WMANT 45 (Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977), 1.

⁷² Polag, *Christologie*, 4, 198-99.

⁷³ Polag, *Christologie*, 33.

⁷⁴ Athanasius Polag, "The Theological Center of the Sayings Source," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. Peter Stuhlmacher, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 97-105, esp. 99.

⁷⁵ See Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaction," 51, idem, "Literary and Stratigraphic Problems," 26, and Risto Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves: A Study of the Mission Instructions of Q*, AASF, Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 47 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1987), 7.

⁷⁶ Polag, *Christologie*, 198-99.

mation of Q which is heavily indebted to classical form criticism's account of the growth of the gospel tradition, but which attempts to get rid of the deficiencies of the latter by (1) specifying just how the Q tradition grew from one stage to the next and by (2) importing acts of reflective composition back to even the earliest stages of the development, thereby largely dispensing with the difficult notion of mere agglomeration.

Schürmann retains the model of tradition growing from simple to complex forms ("...wachsenden Schicht...zu einem 'geschichteten Gebilde'"; "zusammengewachsenes Kompositionsgebilde") and makes this principle fundamental to the formation of Q.⁷⁷ As noted, however, Schürmann introduces a mutation into the old organic model which gets rid of one of its greatest defects: in place of virtually *ad hoc* collection of traditions he postulates cerebral redactional activity at each stage of the tradition's development. Instead of a long chain of agglomerative growth (Schürmann rejects the adequacy of growth mechanisms such as "mechanischen Stichwortkomposition oder einer losen Zusammenfügung unter inhaltlichen Gesichtspunkten")⁷⁸ we have a series of redactional actions, the effect of which is to take the tradition each time to greater compositional complexity. In effect Schürmann distributes the kind of redactional intervention the classical form critics were inclined to reserve for the final stage of the tradition back into all the preceding stages, describing Q as "ein Kompositionsgebilde, dessen Traditionsgeschichte als Geschichte immer neuer redaktioneller Kompositionsvorgänge verstanden werden muß," (identifying again, however, composition history with tradition history).⁷⁹ With this stroke Schürmann gets rid of the old model's greatest handicap by proposing a mechanism to drive the expansion of the tradition. A trace of the old model remains in Schürmann's qualification that redactional intentions appear "especially" at points in the history of the tradition where it is

⁷⁷ Heinz Schürmann, "Das Zeugnis der Redenquelle für die Basileia-Verkündigung Jesu," in *Logia*, 121-200, esp. 127; idem, "Kompositionsgeschichte," 327.

⁷⁸ Schürmann, "Die Redekomposition wider 'dieses Geschlecht' und seine Führung in der Redenquelle (vgl. Mt 23,1-39 par Lk 11,37-54): Bestand-Akolythie-Kompositionsformen," *SNTU* 11 (1986) 33-81, esp. 69.

⁷⁹ Heinz Schürmann, "QLk 11,14-36 kompositionsgeschichtlich befragt," in *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, eds. F. Van Segbroeck et al., BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992), 1.563-86, esp. 563.

textualized, leaving unclarified what tradition-history processes were at work in oral stages. However, this vacillation flickers only briefly; for the most part Schürmann is adamant that redaction is responsible for even the earliest combinations of Jesus' sayings.⁸⁰

Schürmann introduces another modification into the classical model. While retaining the fundamental movement from simple to complex forms, he carefully classifies the increasingly complex stages, thus lending to his model an air of scientific precision. At the beginning of the process are individual sayings ("Grundworte") which are first expanded by an added saying ("Zusatzworte") or commentary saying ("Kommentarworte"), either creative expansions of the basic saying or juxtaposed, previously independent sayings. The next step is the combination of two or more of these paired sayings into short sayings-chains ("Spruchreihen"; "Spruchketten"; "Spruchgruppen"), usually under the coercion of a reflective redactor who strings sayings together to create short elaborations, though sometimes merely on formal grounds such as key word association. The next stage is combination of two or more of these short sayings-chains into longer structured compositions for instructional purposes in diverse community situations ("frühen Kompositionen"; "struktuierten Kompositionen"; "Reden Jesu"). These may have a chreia affixed, making these extended compositions expanded chreias ("Großapophthegmen"). Another redaction collects these sayings complexes into one longer document and by linking them together in meaningful ways produces the final form of Q ("Redenquelle").⁸¹

In spite of its clarity and rootedness in manifest compositional

⁸⁰ Schürmann, "Kompositionsgeschichte," 326.

⁸¹ For this summary I have relied chiefly upon "Zeugnis der Redenquelle," 128-31, with reference to "Kompositionsgeschichte," 332-34, and "Observations on the Son of Man Title in the Speech Source. Its Occurrence in Opening and Closing Expressions," in *Shape of Q*, 74-97, esp. 92, as well as upon Joachim Wanke, "Kommentarworte: Älteste Kommentierungen von Herrenworten," *BZ* 24 (1980) 208-33, esp. 210-13. In "Kompositionsgeschichte" (also "Son of Man Title," 78-79) Schürmann appears to envision a total of five stages by dividing his third stage into two: "strukturelle Komposition" (third stage), "Redekomposition" (fourth stage), with the final Q redaction now becoming a fifth stage. He notes that these two cannot always be distinguished since the "strukturelle Komposition" can also be a speech of Jesus, but that the difference, such as it is, is that the "Redekomposition" can make use of more than one "strukturelle Komposition."

features of Q material, Schürmann's model is susceptible to some criticisms.

(1) *The problem of diachronization*: Paired sayings, short chains of sayings, and longer groupings of sayings are all manifest in the Q material, and Schürmann is justified in isolating and categorizing them. However, his second step whereby he plots these on two coordinated axes of "simple to complex" and "early to late" seems gratuitous. Nothing in the diverse compositional techniques themselves requires that the attributes of "simple/complex" be diachronized. Indeed, once one allows the creative human factor into the formation of the tradition at any point—as Schürmann does—then nothing in principle prevents complex compositions from appearing at the beginning of the process or simple compositions at its end. In the most recent presentation of his model Schürmann appears to retreat from diachronization of the compositional forms: "Aus dem oben gennanten Grund möchten wir die 1. und 2. Kf [Kompositionsformen] dann besser...nicht mehr 'frühe', die 3. und 4. nicht mehr 'späte' Kompositionsform nennen. Man redet besser neutral von 'einfachen' (1. und 2. Kf) und 'ausgebauten' (3. und 4. Kf) Kompositionsformen."⁸² Moreover, Schürmann acknowledges that the same "laws of crystallization" which lead to pairing and grouping of forms are at work at all stages of the tradition, which should lead to caution in arguing from the form of the composition to a stage of composition. However, his tendency to diachronize reasserts itself just a few pages later, where he speaks of "unsere 'archäologischen Probegrabungen' im 'Tel' der Q-Komposition"—large structures being at the top, small ones at the bottom.⁸³ It seems that while Schürmann's model remains a useful tool for analyzing the relationships of juxtaposed units, it does not work as an explanation of the genesis of Q.⁸⁴

(2) *Problem of accessibility to previous stages*: Though Schürmann does not pinpoint which stage forms the transition to textuality, it can be assumed that he supposes at least one or two, or perhaps even more, of his stages to occur in an oral situation. Klaus

⁸² Schürmann, "Kompositionsgeschichte," 330, note 36. He makes a similar acknowledgment in "Zeugnis der Redenquelle," 128.

⁸³ Schürmann, "Kompositionsgeschichte," 330, 334.

⁸⁴ See Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 252.

Berger, however, argues that "wegen der bekannten Differenz von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit halte ich es für unmöglich, durch literarkritische Operationen mündliche Vorstufen zu erstellen...."⁸⁵ Access to the history of the tradition in the oral period is largely restricted to the observation that small units, now constituent elements of a fixed text, may at one time have functioned in oral contexts. Therefore, positing text-formative stages behind the present text without secure literary-critical justification is precarious and virtually impossible if early stages are viewed as oral.⁸⁶ In the same vein, Schürmann's model cannot deliver a satisfactory account of Q's textual form at any given point in its diachronic development prior to the final redaction. To be sure, Schürmann asserts that the large complexes led separate lives in diverse community settings prior to their combination in the final redaction, but in the same breath he acknowledges that "we still lack material criteria, but beyond that also formal characteristics by which to delineate these four stages."⁸⁷

(3) *Problem of attestation*: Schürmann's developmental model is self-referential; he adduces no similar compositional model from ancient literature.⁸⁸ This may betray the vestigial influence of the *Kleinliteratur* conception.

(4) *Problem of unassimilated tradition*: At times, perhaps even most of the time, Schürmann estimates the thoroughness of the final redactor's work quite highly. At other times, however, Schürmann's final redactor resembles the one made familiar by the form critics, namely, who frequently transmits traditions without assigning them significant roles in the new redaction. This becomes

⁸⁵ Klaus Berger, *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984), 14; see also idem, *Einführung*, 22-23, Sellin, "'Gattung,'" 312, 321, Leif E. Vaage, "The Son of Man Sayings in Q: Stratigraphical Location and Significance," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 103-29, esp. 106, Gerd Theissen, *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*, trans. Francis McDonagh, ed. John Riches (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 189-90, and Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 35.

⁸⁶ Sellin, "'Gattung,'" 321. Wanke, "'Kommentarworte,'" 209, acknowledges that "die weitere Vorgeschichte dieser in Q erkennbaren Traditions-'Blöcke' ist äußerst schwierig zu erhellen und mit vielen Unsicherheiten belastet."

⁸⁷ Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 79.

⁸⁸ See John S. Kloppenborg, "Conflict and Invention: Recent Studies on Q" in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995), 1-14, esp. 7, and Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 123.

evident in Schürmann's treatment of the Son of Man sayings in Q, which according to Schürmann were significant commentary sayings at primitive stages of the tradition, but in the final form of Q were "merely transmitted."⁸⁹ However, the fact that the redactor accepted them into the redaction when they might have been eliminated suggests that the sayings may have been in some sense significant for the redactor and the recipients; the sayings may play some compositional role in Q regardless of their tradition-history. Schürmann appeals to Paul, "who avoids the title," to Luke's and Matthew's special material which likewise do not preserve it, and to "Mark and John, who in each case reinterpreted the title and made it subservient to their respective Christologies."⁹⁰ But these parallels show exactly what recourse a redactor had when presented with uncongenial tradition: edit it out (Paul, perhaps SLk and SMt), or re-interpret it (Mark and John).

Zeller

Zeller's cataloguing of compositional, editorial techniques constitutes a major contribution to understanding the formation of Q. In particular Zeller argues that juxtaposition of units itself represents significant redactional activity. Cohesion in juxtaposition is established by means of key words, repeated motifs, coordinating conjunctions and particles, anaphoric pronouns, and form-critical similarity (for example, serialization of beatitudes or woes).⁹¹ This detailing of redactional techniques introduces a crucial literary-critical dimension into Q studies which had heretofore been either absent or poorly articulated and haphazardly applied. Zeller's catalogue provides a control on redaction histories predicated upon theological coherence or social history trajectories, for it directs attention to *linguistic* usages which establish compositional links in the text and reflect editorial activity. It is hard to over-estimate the importance of this advance.

However, Zeller's overall approach to Q is guided by Schür-

⁸⁹ Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 93.

⁹⁰ Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 93

⁹¹ Dieter Zeller, "Redactional Processes and Changing Settings in the Q-Material," in *Shape of Q*, 116-30, esp. 118-20.

mann's (and the classical form-critical) model for reconstructing the redaction history of Q. Zeller locates Q's genesis in primitive combinations of single sayings into pairs which, in combination with other pairs, grew ("zusammengewachsen") into sayings complexes linked by theme and catchword. These were in turn linked with others by means of catchwords to form larger sayings complexes. The final redaction of Q arranged these into significant sequences. Zeller shares with Schürmann the belief in development on a chronological axis from simple to complex forms and that redaction operates at all stages. He is ambiguous about the moment(s) of textualization but tends to place it at later stages where redaction collocates longer sayings groups.⁹² The problematic nature of this model was discussed above in relation to Schürmann and need not be rehearsed here.

Zeller assimilates Q to the *Kleinliteratur* conception without apology. Behind the collection, formation, and transmission of Q material in all its stages stand anonymous groups active in missionary proclamation and community instruction. The first tradents were bands of wandering charismatic preachers who founded settled communities. Within these communities arose new instructional settings which in turn drove the expansion of the tradition as sayings useful to those settings were collected and transmitted. Though Zeller imputes redactional activity to every stage of the tradition's expansion, he leaves no doubt that the force behind the shaping of the sayings tradition was the community, not an individual, specialized redactor, all the more so since the formation of the different sayings complexes is dispersed over many different settings and times.⁹³ Whoever the redactors may have been, in Zeller's view they certainly were not capable of producing sophisticated literature but were most likely members of the wandering preaching bands or pneumatic teachers whose own inspired utterances found their way into the collections. Zeller attributes textualization to the charismatic teachers in a community setting, so to the extent that wandering charismatics were

⁹² Programmatic statements of this model may be found in Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 120-23, and in idem, *Kommentar zur Logienquelle*, SKK, Neues Testament 21 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984), 13.

⁹³ Dieter Zeller, *Die Weisheitliche Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern*, FzB 17 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977), 192-93; also idem, "Redactional Processes," 118, 128-29.

its original tradents, the Q material at first circulated orally.⁹⁴ The final form of Q reflects its origins; Zeller describes it as a "Gemisch", "ein durchgehendes Gewebe, geknüpft mit inhaltlich Verwandtem und Stichworten."⁹⁵

We see how closely Zeller's conception of the formation of Q adheres to the classical form-critical model of the formation of the synoptic tradition and its reconstruction of the social history of primitive Christianity: origin and transmission in oral settings of enthusiastic groups, a trajectory from orality to final textuality, a trajectory from missionary proclamation into community settings, and redactional activity restricted to collection and linking of sayings-complexes generated in these various settings. Moreover, Zeller places Q on Bultmann's and Schulz's social-history trajectory from a Palestinian, Aramaic setting to a Hellenistic, Jewish-Christian community.⁹⁶ He thus manifests the tendency observed in other Q scholarship to explain the formation of the text by plotting it along a privileged theological or social history trajectory. This approach to Q appears virtually by default, for it is difficult to conceive how literary-critical criteria might be useful in analysis of a document that was formed according to no known canons of literature. In accordance with this view, Zeller sees little profit from comparing Q with ancient literature, for Q sayings groups are largely characterized by "Mangel an Gestaltung."⁹⁷ Topical considerations hold the sayings together; no formal structuring, other than interconnections established by a few simple editorial techniques, plays a compositional role. Q is a miscellany of materials, forms, and genres. No specific generic affiliation can be assigned to it as a whole; it is a unique document for which the ancient world can provide no adequate term of comparison.⁹⁸ Hence the appropriate tool for investigating Q is not literary analysis but tradition history.⁹⁹

⁹⁴ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 192, 196-98.

⁹⁵ Dieter Zeller, "Eine Weisheitliche Grundschrift in der Logienquelle?" in *Four Gospels*, 1.389-401, esp. 401; idem, *Kommentar*, 15.

⁹⁶ Zeller, *Kommentar*, 95; idem, "Redactional Processes," 129.

⁹⁷ Zeller, "Weisheitliche Grundschrift," 397, allegedly because they lack proemia and conclusions, though Zeller makes an exception in the case of the Sermon (6:20b-49).

⁹⁸ Zeller, "Weisheitliche Grundschrift," 401. Zeller does offer *Sirach* as a distant comparison.

⁹⁹ Zeller, "Weisheitliche Grundschrift," 391.

The inadequacy of Zeller's description of Q becomes apparent in his own analysis of the smaller sayings clusters. On the one hand, Zeller assimilates them to his developmental model but on the other attributes to them recurrent structural regularities: a beginning featuring a thematic imperative followed by a motive clause, a main body featuring two rhetorical questions, and a concluding statement.¹⁰⁰ Zeller leaves unclarified how, given such a loose history of formation in which clusters take form in diverse enthusiastic oral settings at different times and under the auspices of anonymous groups, Q should come to display even a modicum of compositional regularity.¹⁰¹

Jacobson

Arland D. Jacobson is one of the first Q scholars to undertake a redaction history of Q while at the same time consciously attempting to separate such analysis from the *Kleinliteratur* model. However, despite Jacobson's best efforts to cast it off, elements of the old model still cling to his methodology and affect his compositional analysis. Nevertheless, with Jacobson we find a fresh approach to Q, particularly in his conception of Q as *composed*.

Jacobson proposes a combination of theological/thematic and literary-critical approaches to Q compositional analysis.¹⁰² He makes numerous astute and potentially fertile observations throughout the course of his study, for example, noting that Q 3:7-9, 16-17 and 7:18-35 together form "compositional clamps" and that the first large section of Q (3:7-7:35) and the second large section (9:57-10:22) both culminate in passages (7:31-35; 10:21-22) replete with Wisdom motifs.¹⁰³ In general, however, Jacobson views the compositional techniques operative in Q's formation as being quite primitive. This is consistent with his notion

¹⁰⁰ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 142.

¹⁰¹ An incongruity pointed out by Ronald A. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 65.

¹⁰² Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 7. Published in expanded form in 1992, Jacobson's study dates to his 1978 Claremont dissertation, "Wisdom Christology in Q."

¹⁰³ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 125, 130.

that sayings collections in general do not display much structure.¹⁰⁴ While Jacobson at times does appear to attribute some compositional sophistication to Q, stating for example that in Q sayings "are made into building blocks for larger literary schemes,"¹⁰⁵ in practice his major heuristic instrument is the criterion of contiguous catchword connection of individual units, the application of which he uses to support claims of redactional interventions upon and into earlier layers: "It is particularly satisfying when one is able to recover a text which, when the later additions are removed, is a coherent whole, with connections (e.g., catchwords) linking material which has been interrupted by later material."¹⁰⁶

Therefore, despite his suspicion of the classical form-critical model, Jacobson's *de facto* conception of Q is not that far removed from it. Lacking more extensive literary-critical controls, his important proposal that "it is the deuteronomistic tradition which provides the theological framework for the redaction of Q, and thus is the theological basis for its [Q's formative stratum] literary unity,"¹⁰⁷ becomes in part self-confirming: units which, when viewed in isolation, do not appear to bear the deuteronomistic imprint or in Jacobson's judgment cannot be brought into the deuteronomistic orbit are barred from the formative redaction of Q and gathered into previous collections or deferred to later redactions. Thus Jacobson's analysis, though in an admirable manner frequently coordinated with appeals to editorial techniques, does not move all that far beyond predecessors who likewise appeal to a certain set of theological or social history categories to sort out what is primary and secondary in Q redaction. Though in principle the criterion of thematic or theological coherence to define textual layers is sound,¹⁰⁸ when applied without an adequate set of controls (e.g., recognition of operative genres and hence compositional conventions of antiquity), it allows excessively free play to the contemporary scholar's somewhat subjective

¹⁰⁴ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 61, referring to "the kind of miscellaneous assortment of sayings that one often finds in sayings collections," and averring that sayings collections are "generally rather haphazardly arranged" (43).

¹⁰⁵ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 44.

¹⁰⁶ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 45.

¹⁰⁷ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 72.

¹⁰⁸ Kloppenborg, "Literary and Stratigraphic Problems," 26.

tive judgments.¹⁰⁹ It may in fact be the case that hierarchializing arrangements enabled by such conventions have bound what in isolation seem theologically and thematically diverse traditions into a compositional unity so tight that redaction-*history* judgments are unwarranted.

In Jacobson's case, the acuteness of this problem becomes evident in cases where compositional and theological indicators appear to conflict. As noted, he makes what may be an important macro-compositional observation that the first (3:7-7:35) and second (9:57-10:22) sections of Q both culminate in pericopes featuring wisdom motifs (7:31-35; 10:21-22).¹¹⁰ However, instead of taking this pattern of recurrence as possible evidence of a unified editorial initiative creating coherence across broad reaches of text, Jacobson places the concluding units in separate strata because of the overriding mandate he has granted to his operative theological principle: 7:31-35 is early because it reflects the formative deuteronomistic conception (John and Jesus equally messengers of Wisdom) whereas 10:21-22 is a late insertion because it allegedly reflects the altered, post-rejection self-understanding of the Q community and a higher Christology than that evident in 7:31-35.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ Paul M. Joyce notes the difficulty of applying the criterion of "consistency of theological content" where "the danger of built-in assumptions dictating results is all too evident...." ("Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives on Ezekiel," in *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*, ed. Johannes C. De Moor [Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995], 115-28, esp. 117-18). F. Gerald Downing in particular has criticized the tendency of Q stratigraphical proposals to be uncontrolled by reference to ancient compositional techniques; see "Word Processing in the Ancient World: The Social Production and Performance of Q," *JSTOT* 64 (1996) 29-48.

¹¹⁰ The significance of this observation increases when one realizes that (1) the final pericope of the third section of Q likewise is top-loaded with Wisdom conceptions (11:49-51; [13:34-35]), and that (2) some *Sirach* scholars have proposed that "Wisdom" passages are utilized in that text as section markers (see below, chapter four).

¹¹¹ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 130, 133, 151. Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaction," 53-54, adduces an example of how conflicting theological criteria lead to conflicting redaction histories with respect to 7:28 and 7:31-35. Jacobson and Lührmann, using different theological motifs, assign these to different strata. Lührmann assigns 7:28 to a *pre-redactional* level in which rivalry with John's disciples was the formative issue and 7:31-35 to the final redaction because in it John and Jesus stand together against "this generation," which is Lührmann's formative motif. Jacobson presumes that in his formative stratum, featuring deuteronomistic rejection of the prophets, John and Jesus are seen as equals;

For Jacobson Q in its present form is a patchwork of differences, tensions, and disruptions.¹¹² Elements of earlier strata stand uncomfortably alongside later strata or are broken by insertions. Coherence is a property internal to various strata; each new redaction leaves the previous one largely undigested. A stratum's internal coherence on the one hand and its tension with other strata on the other provide the means for distinguishing it.¹¹³ Motifs separated by long stretches of text (for example, Son of Man and Kingdom of God) lack clear relations of coherence.¹¹⁴ Because contiguous "catchword" composition is taken to be the most prevalent editorial technique, a major task of analysis is subtraction of intrusions irruptive of primitive catchword connections in order to recover coherent strata, though in fact the gratuitous application of the label "catchword" to the phenomenon of recurrent lexemes may itself beg important questions. Jacobson gives little attention to possible new relations created by the juxtaposition of putatively old and new materials or to the reception of old materials by the current tradent group. In effect this perpetuates the *Kleinliteratur* view of Q in which new material accretes to a body of tradition as it and the tradent community move through a social history.

thus, he coincides with Lührmann in places 7:31-35 in a formative redaction, but makes 7:28 the insertion of a *later* redaction reflecting a time when Jesus' status was seen as greater than John's. In principle there seems no way of deciding between the two options; both are valid deductions from valid theological and social-history premises. To further complicate the picture, Richard A. Horsley, "Questions about Redactional Strata and the Social Relations Reflected in Q," in *SBLSP 28*, ed. David Lull (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 186-203, esp. 194, argues that 7:31-35 belongs in an *early* stage of Q's formation, since its envisioning of conflict between the prophets John and Jesus with ruling elites ("this generation") reflects the earliest Christian understanding of Jesus' death.

¹¹² On this see Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Temptation Narrative in Q" in *Four Gospels*, 1.479-507, esp. 482, against Jacobson's notion (*First Gospel*, 89-92) that the Temptation criticizes enthusiastic attitudes towards miracles visible elsewhere in Q.

¹¹³ Jacobson calls the formative deuteronomic redaction the "index fossil" whose wide distribution as a putative stratum throughout Q allows him to distinguish it from later strata and vice versa (*First Gospel*, 253; see also 45-47). For a critique see Harry T. Fleddermann, review of *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q*, by Arland D. Jacobson, *JBL* 113 (1994) 334-36, esp. 336.

¹¹⁴ Arland D. Jacobson, "Apocalyptic and the Synoptic Sayings Source Q" in *Four Gospels 1992* 1.403-19, esp. 415-17.

Schmithals

On the one hand Schmithals argues that Q is a literarily formed text comparable to other literary works of antiquity, not a stratum of tradition subject to uncontrolled growth; otherwise, it would not have reached Matthew and Luke in the form of comparable exemplars. As regards genre Q is a "Spruchsammlung" comparable to Proverbs, *Sirach*, *Gospel of Thomas*, *Sentences of Sextus*, and "Epikurs Sentenzensammlung," though the introduction of narrative material has disturbed Q's generic purity and moved it towards the gospel genre, rendering it a "Mischform."¹¹⁵ On the other hand, Q owes its formation to successive redactions of layers of tradition recoverable with the aid of tradition-history analysis. The doublets shared by Mark and Q define the essential contours of Q¹—a non-christological (here Schmithals agrees with Polag), apocalyptically and enthusiastically oriented collection of logia advocating an "Interimsethik". In the case of Q¹ one is justified in speaking of "einer wachsenden Schicht." This primitive collection, which ranks Jesus and John together as prophets of the Kingdom, was used selectively by Mark. A christological redaction, influenced by Mark's gospel and responsible for the introduction of narrative materials, produced Q², the effect of which was to move the sayings materials of the first redaction under the rubric of an exalted christology.¹¹⁶

Schmithals' reconstruction of Q's formative history attempts to correlate tradition-history analysis with genre attributions, but genre considerations play virtually no role in the actual redaction-history investigation. This leads to some discrepancies: Q¹ is supposedly a "Spruchsammlung" comparable to other specimens of ancient wisdom genres, yet Schmithals suggests that the presence of certain materials which present Jesus as a "Weisheitslehrer" in this "prophetic-apocalyptic" layer is mysterious, especially given the fact that this theme is unattested in Marcan doublets. Moreover, as noted above, Schmithals initially views the "growing stratum" view of Q's formation as being incongruent with indicators that it is a literarily formed text, yet allows the former description to stand in the case of Q¹ while offering

¹¹⁵ Walter Schmithals, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1985), 219, 224, 228-29.

¹¹⁶ Schmithals, *Einleitung*, 396-402.

nothing to distinguish the nature of its formative non-christological redaction from the christological redaction of Q². Such incongruencies emerge inevitably from Schmithals' actual procedure: the decisive categories for determining his redaction history are supplied by a privileged social and theological trajectory which traces "the decisive transition from pre-Christian apocalyptic to genuinely Christian theology within the composition history of Q itself."¹¹⁷ Instead of supplying composition-critical controls on such procedures (or better, taking priority over such procedures), Schmithals's genre ascriptions are at best invoked selectively.

Uro

In the proposed layering of the Mission Speech Uro theorizes a movement from a positive mission to Israel by charismatic wandering preachers (primitive mission instructions; 10:4-11), to a layer tinged with pessimism provoked by Israel's rejection of the message (10:3-16), to a final ecclesiastical redaction and textualization (9:57ff; 10:2, 21-22) carried out within the settled communities. Uro suggests that the results of this redactional analysis of the Mission complex might be extended to Q as a whole.¹¹⁸

Despite the excellence of Uro's analysis in manifold points of detail, the affiliation of this account of Q's formation with the *Kleinliteratur* model should be obvious immediately, particularly in the conception of redaction history as a process of expanding traditions, produced by anonymous tradents in turn linked to changing community settings, topped off by a final redaction responsible for textualization. As is typical in *Kleinliteratur* accounts of Q, the final redaction lightly impresses itself upon the tradition, allowing the easy detection underneath of layers of tradition witnessing to respective shifts in community settings.

Uro attempts, however, to come to grips with the problem of defining the ontology of previous strata. He identifies 10:3-16 with Lührmann's final redaction (and Jacobson's formative redaction) in which the Q group's rejection by Israel, interpreted deuteronomistically, is the formative influence (linking this stratum as well with 6:27-35; 11:29-32; 11:47-51; 13:34-35; 12:2-12,

¹¹⁷ Kloppenborg, "Literary and Stratigraphic Problems," 23, 24, note 110.

¹¹⁸ Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 185-98.

with 10:2, 21-22; 9:57-60 representing the subsequent ecclesiastical redaction). Uro rejects the notion that Q was formed into a coherent document at the intermediate redaction, for "it is difficult for me to see how the collections compared above would constitute a structured writing." His solution, however, is to push the problem back into nebulous tradition-history: "The development...therefore, must be understood in tradition-critical terms rather than redaction-critically....our 'intermediate layer' is a tradition-critical generalization and does not signify a single redaction in the literary growth of Q."¹¹⁹ It is not clear how this resolves the problem of the contours of the intermediate layer, particularly since Uro uses the same social-history and theological-history criteria for isolating the final, "ecclesiastical" textual redaction as he does for isolating the intermediate tradition-history layers.¹²⁰

Like many of his predecessors, Uro uses certain theological and social-history categories to work out Q's formative history. These include (1) a trajectory from an enthusiastic movement of early charismatics to an institutional structure, (2) application of an Israel-to-church paradigm, (3) development from low to high Christology, and (4) the deuteronomistic rejection of the prophets motif.¹²¹ Missing from this account of abrupt shifts in the constitution and setting of the tradent group is discussion of how these shifts were mediated and how or why later community configurations appropriated the ethos of traditions accepted from previous stages.¹²²

Nothing intrinsic, however, prevents Uro's account of the formation of Q from being correct. The problem is lack of composition-critical controls which might verify or correct theories which plot Q materials along postulated tradition-history trajectories. There is no reason to prefer Uro's redactional analysis of Q to Jacobson's or Lührmann's or vice versa: all rest on plausible social and theological-history models. Uro asserts that "a sharp distinction between the redaction/composition-critical and tradition-critical approaches is not methodologically useful in this

¹¹⁹ Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 197-98.

¹²⁰ See, for example, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 170-72.

¹²¹ Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 185-99, 206-207, 210-35, 241-43.

¹²² See Christopher M. Tuckett, "On the Stratification of Q: A Response," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 213-22, esp. 214.

kind of enterprise."¹²³ Such a statement is intelligible given a *Kleinliteratur* conception of Q. However, when composition history is so assimilated to tradition history, the number of possible redaction histories of Q is limited only by the number of tradition histories imaginable.¹²⁴

Kloppenborg

Robinson's pathbreaking proposal that Q should be identified with a genre called "Logoi Sophon" supplies the precedent for Kloppenborg's own seminal initiative.¹²⁵ A criticism Robinson encountered was that the genre description, "Logoi Sophon," was too broad to be analytically useful.¹²⁶ It was on this point that

¹²³ Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 97.

¹²⁴ Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, "Christentum und Judentum in der Logienquelle," *EvT* 51 (1991) 344-64, offers a multi-stage redaction history plotted along (1) a line of historical development beginning at Easter and terminating with the Jewish War, and (2) a literary history which begins with paired dominical sayings (early) and develops to the later assimilation of the types of material found in the gospels, such as miracle stories and biographical materials (late). The polemical sayings define the church over against Israel, and so are to be placed just before the Jewish War when the separation was taking place. Mark Robin Fairchild, "Eschatology in the Q Source," Dissertation, Drew University, 1989, employs interwoven theological-history trajectories—(1) mission to Israel, failure of mission to Israel, rejection of Israel, development of the Gentile church; (2) imminent expectation, delay of parousia; (3) future Son of man of Daniel 7, present Son of man of Ezekiel; (4) apocalyptic, de-apocalypticization, sapiential—to map out a redaction history for Q. With regard to the future-present Son of Man trajectory, Fairchild reverses Leif Vaage's order (see below), and his imputation of de-apocalypticization in Q to the second redaction (appealing to the *Gos. Thom.* to establish the putative trajectory) roughly reverses Kloppenborg's account.

¹²⁵ Robinson, "LOGOI SOPHON," 73-74. Robinson continued, however, to work with *Kleinliteratur* conceptions of Q's formation. In "Early Collections of Jesus' Sayings," in *Logia*, 389-94, esp. 394, he posits the genre incarnation of Q as the end result of a simple-to-complex developmental process. In "The Q Trajectory: Between John and Matthew Via Jesus," in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, ed. Birger A. Pearson (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 173-94, esp. 188-89, he works with christological development categories to work out a redaction history (see also "Die Logienquelle: Weisheit oder Prophetie? Anfragen an Migaku Sato, *Q und Prophetie*," *EvT* 53 [1993] 367-89, esp. 373), though in the case of the two last-mentioned essays, Robinson assumes the results of Kloppenborg's redaction-history analysis. In a recent essay Robinson imputes a macro level of coherence to the Inaugural Discourse ("The Sayings Gospel Q," in *Four Gospels*, 1.361-88, esp. 361).

¹²⁶ See, for example, Sato, *Prophetie*, 3-4, and Richard A. Horsley, "Wisdom

Kloppenborg took up the task of determining more precisely the formative genre of Q.¹²⁷

Though Kloppenborg appropriates a great deal of his predecessors' work, his challenge to the operative paradigms in previous Q research and corresponding establishment of a new framework for Q analysis give his work pivotal status in the history of Q research. The debate following upon publication of *Formation of Q* has focused upon the details of Kloppenborg's distribution of Q materials into the proposed strata Q¹, Q², and Q³. Largely lacking in this debate has been any broad appraisal of the significance of his general approach in the context of the history of Q research. This can be set forth under several broad headings:

(1) *Explicit repudiation of the Kleinliteratur paradigm*: For Kloppenborg, the *Kleinliteratur* model, especially its absorption of Q into the stream of developing tradition, has at least hindered if not prevented exploration of its possible literary contours.¹²⁸ Other scholars had introduced modifications and qualifications into the classical paradigm as it was applied to Q; Kloppenborg questions the usefulness of the paradigm as a whole.

(2) *Positing of scribal Q-redactors*: The classical form critics and their successors diminished the role of the Q redactor, sometimes to a vanishing-point. Kloppenborg proposes in contrast to this that the Q redactors were scribes and thus the repositories of literary skill within their cultures, capable of producing sophisticated literary structures and arguments, though to be sure, Kloppenborg locates the framers of Q in the lower ranks of the scribal profession—village-based scribes trained to carry out mundane administrative tasks.¹²⁹

(3) *Adducing of comparative literature*: Most previous Q scholars, adopting the *Kleinliteratur* assumption that Q is *sui generis*, took Q as their only point of reference. A few made passing compar-

Justified by All Her Children: Examining Allegedly Disparate Traditions in Q," in *SBLSP 33*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering Jr. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 733-51, esp. 739.

¹²⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 30-31.

¹²⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 8, 39.

¹²⁹ Kloppenborg, "Conflict and Invention," 5-6; idem, "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, ed. Ronald A. Piper, NovTSuppl 75 (Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995), 275-319, esp. 318.

isons with ancient literature; almost none of those making genre proposals used such as a principle of analysis. Kloppenborg argues that such comparisons should be a *programmatic* aspect of Q research.¹³⁰

(4) *Recognition of the connection between form and meaning*: Most previous Q research produced encompassing theologies/christologies of Q or atomistically interpreted units of material while either ignoring or expressly rejecting the principle that the compositional setting of the various units of tradition affects their significance. Kloppenborg argues that determination of the framework genre in which the various traditions are embedded should be central to interpretive work.¹³¹

How does this shift in paradigm make itself evident in Kloppenborg's own work? In fact Kloppenborg did not start *de novo*, but, as noted, inherited many of the conceptions of his predecessors while seeking to modify them in light of his paradigmatic concerns:

(1) *Sayings-cluster composition*: In *Formation of Q*, Kloppenborg views the compositional techniques operative in the formation of the sayings-clusters as rather primitive. While acknowledging the significance of the hermeneutics of juxtaposition, Kloppenborg speaks in the main of association of individual sayings on the basis of "catchword, thematic or formal association, or syntactical connective," thus remaining largely within the framework established by Zeller.¹³² He states, "Q does not evince great sophistication in its architecture; literary organization is rather simple, restricted to topical and catchword association."¹³³ At times it seems he assumes that the clusters grew diachronically from simple to complex form along the lines suggested by Schürmann. However, within *Formation of Q* itself a tension between the multi-stage view of the formation of sayings clusters and a rhetorical-compositional view is apparent. On the one hand Kloppenborg approves of several of Schürmann's accounts of sayings-cluster formation. On

¹³⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 89, 323-24.

¹³¹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 37-38; see also Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia and London: Trinity Press International, 1990), 149.

¹³² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 98.

¹³³ John S. Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People Behind the Document," *CuRBS* 1 (1993) 9-34, esp. 25.

the other hand he comments on the composition, structure, and rhetorical effectiveness of virtually all the clusters in their present format. This is evident in Kloppenborg's treatment of 6:27-35 in which he expresses agreement with Schürmann's account of the diachronic formation of the cluster around the kernel of the love command but also calls the passage "a very carefully structured set of admonitions and motive clauses, constructed from several originally independent sayings."¹³⁴ This tension is problematic, for it is never clarified how a sayings-cluster formed over time at the hand of a number of redactors, as demanded by Schürmann's model, should come to have the rhetorically integrated form which Kloppenborg explicates. In a later publication Kloppenborg states that "the instructional speeches....display...signs of deliberate stylization and reflect some of the techniques fostered in rhetorical schools."¹³⁵ Kloppenborg applies this model to the "Love your enemies" cluster as follows: verses 27-30 are an opening set of imperatives, followed by pathetic rhetorical in verse 31, in turn followed by a set of enthymemes in verses 32-34, concluded by "rhetorical induction" based on a *paradeigma* in verse 35. The passage as a whole is a piece of deliberative rhetoric.¹³⁶ This is in effect a synchronic model of composition.

(2) *Modification of the tradition-redaction distinction:* Kloppenborg rejects the notion that Q consists of a redaction which only lightly worked over a body of rather amorphous tradition, proposing instead a framework genre for the first stratum of Q, namely, Near Eastern Instruction.¹³⁷ It was this literarily-formed material which presented itself to the second redactor. By positing a thoroughgoing literary formation at the very first appearance of what in any way could be designated the coherent entity "Q" Kloppenborg virtually eliminates the tradition-redaction model and with the same stroke proposes a solution to the problem of the

¹³⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 174-77.

¹³⁵ John S. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 77-102, esp. 84; see also idem, "Conflict and Invention," 3-4.

¹³⁶ Kloppenborg, "Social History," 81-82.

¹³⁷ The wisdom speeches making up the formative stratum are 6:20-23b, 27-49; 9:57-62; 10:2-11, 16; 11:2-4, 9-13; 12:2-7, 11-12; 12:22b-34; 13:24; 17:33; 14:34-35.

textual ontology of postulated previous stages of Q. The constituent instructional speeches of this formative stratum themselves show evidence of composition. Kloppenborg states:

Moreover, in the structure of these imperatives [in the formative instructional stratum], Q is not simply an agglomeration of sayings, but resembles the organizing techniques of some of the more sophisticated instructions....In four of Q's speeches (6:20b-49; 9:57-10:16; 12:2-7, 11-12; 13:24-14:34), a relatively sophisticated structure is observed. Each cluster begins with a programmatic saying or group of sayings...and then follows the imperatival or hortatory section.¹³⁸

What Kloppenborg proposes in place of the old model is an initial literary formation—Q¹, sapiential speeches—in turn redacted into a second recognizable literary formation—Q², announcement of judgment—which with regard to genre takes a turn toward chreia collection.¹³⁹

However, some unresolved tension appears in Kloppenborg's characterization of the formative stratum related to that present in his ambivalent views on the composition of the smaller sayings clusters, for at times he describes the formation of the sapiential stratum in terms redolent of the old tradition-redaction and aggregative model. For instance, he states:

It seems necessary to identify a formative stratum which has been created by progressive aggregation, and one or more secondary elaborations or expansions. While some of these secondary additions may involve individual commentary sayings, in other cases it is a matter of the insertion of a relatively substantial block of sayings which itself is the product of a progressive aggregation of materials.¹⁴⁰

In my view this ambiguity stems from the fact that Kloppenborg, despite conceiving of Q as being a sophisticated literary

¹³⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 318; see also idem, "The Formation of Q Revisited: A Response to Richard Horsley," in *SBLSP 28*, ed. David Lull (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 204-15, esp. 210, and idem, "'Easter Faith' and the Sayings Gospel Q," in *The Apocryphal Jesus and Christian Origins = Semeia 49*, ed. Ron Cameron (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 71-99, esp. 85.

¹³⁹ The insertion of 6:23c; 10:12-15, 21-24; 12:8-10; 13:26-30, 34-35; 14:26-24 plus the blocks of new material 3:7-9, 16-17; 7:1-10, 18-26, 31-35; 11:14-26, 29-36, 39-52; 12:39-40, 42-46, 49, 51-53, 54-56, 57-59; 17:23, 24, 26-30, 34-35, 37b by the second redactor created Q².

¹⁴⁰ Kloppenborg, "Literary and Stratigraphic Problems," 20.

artifact, still imputes rather primitive compositional techniques to its formation at all levels, as noted positing catchword composition (at times rather *ad hoc*) and thematic and formal clusterings, while allowing for some differentiation of style among different sections of Q. He states:

For example, the sayings in Q 7:18-28, 31-35 are associated, rather artificially, by the common mention of John the Baptist, even though this unit expresses views of John that cannot easily be harmonized. Such tensions, however, are to be expected with catchword composition. By contrast, a greater degree of material coherence is achieved in the units in Q 11:2-4, 9-13 or Q 12:22b-31, 33-34 or 12:2-7, which are organized topically, and Q 6:20b-49 which displays a more complicated rhetorical organization. The means by which one large block of material is associated with another is, however, often catchword.¹⁴¹

(3) *Distinction of strata*: Kloppenborg remains interested primarily—even programmatically—in the compositional *history* of Q, that is, in recovering strata through application of the principle of stratigraphical coherence, and in this respect stands in continuity with his predecessors, especially Lührmann and Jacobson.¹⁴² However, he makes the crucial modification of introducing new literary-critical criteria into the methodology for distinguishing layers. The most important of these is the correlation of a proposed stratum with a literary genre and the corresponding use of genre affinity to corroborate the redaction-critical identification of material intruded from other strata. As noted, Kloppenborg identifies his formative stratum with the genre Instruction on the basis of comparison of the form-critical characteristics of compositions located in that stratum with similar structures found in other ancient instructional literature, particularly from ancient Egypt.¹⁴³ He then makes this fruitful for stratification of Q by noting points at which material which appears to be foreign to the genre appears, apparently intrusively, in the instructional

¹⁴¹ Kloppenborg, "Literary and Stratigraphic Problems," 20; see also idem, "The Formation of Q and Antique Instructional Genres," in *Shape of Q*, 138-55, esp. 149 and idem, "Recent Opinion," 25.

¹⁴² See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 98-99, idem, "Literary and Stratigraphic Problems," 6, 39, and idem, "Tradition and Redaction," 56.

¹⁴³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 269, 317-18; idem, "Antique Instructional Genres," 152-54.

speeches, arguing, for example, that Q 6:23c is intrusive within the context of the sapiential speech 6:20b-49. Such a determination is then correlated with the results of the more familiar stratigraphical operation of locating 6:23c within a thematically coherent stratum of its own.¹⁴⁴

To determine his second stratum (announcement of judgment) Kloppenborg resorts in large part to other criteria: shifts in projected audience,¹⁴⁵ shift from paraenesis to polemic,¹⁴⁶ concentration of prophetic forms and chreias,¹⁴⁷ and, finally, the presence of deuteronomic theological motifs (used by Jacobson to identify his *formative* stratum),¹⁴⁸ correlated with the supposition that it would be difficult to find a place for these elements within the instructional genre of the first stratum. Because the material of the second stratum appears mostly in extended chreias, Kloppenborg proposes a genre-shift toward chreia collection.¹⁴⁹ The effect of this proposal is to give to the second redaction a level of genre-coherence (chreia collection) which approaches the level of that enjoyed by the first redaction (Instruction).

It is not clear, however, that this genre identification is as successful as the first. In the Greco-Roman world chreias were considered to be paraenetic devices and functioned as such even when used polemically. Kloppenborg acknowledges that the form is flexible and has wisdom affinities.¹⁵⁰ It may be possible to argue that rather than Q manifesting a *shift* toward chreia collection, Instruction provides the framework genre for the elaborated chreiae, a plausible scenario within the cultural fusions charac-

¹⁴⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 190.

¹⁴⁵ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 167, from instruction to the community (Q¹), to polemic against "this generation" (Q²).

¹⁴⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 322.

¹⁴⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 170; idem, "Antique Instructional Genres," 145. Some of Kloppenborg's critics assume that since chreias also appear in the formative stratum (for example, 9:57-60), the significance of this feature as an indicator of stratification is impaired (Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 51; Zeller, "Weisheitliche Grundschrift," 391-92; James G. Williams, "Parable and Chreia: From Q to Narrative Gospel," in *Genre, Narrativity, and Theology = Semeia* 43, eds. Mary Gerhart and James G. Williams [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988], 85-114, esp. 108-109). As far as I can tell, Kloppenborg's argument is never that chreias appear only in Q² but only that this proposed stratum is characterized by a *concentration* of chreias within the context of other stratigraphical indicators.

¹⁴⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 167, 170.

¹⁴⁹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 322-23.

¹⁵⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 323; idem, "Easter Faith," 85.

teristic of the Hellenistic-Imperial period. Kloppenborg's sapiential stratum already contains at least one speech inaugurated by a *chreia* (9:57-60; 10:2-11, 16).

Several scholars have challenged Kloppenborg's separation of Q's wisdom-instructional and prophetic-polemical materials into separate strata on the basis of the fact that the two kinds of material are not generically incompatible, as many ancient texts which combine the two manifestly demonstrate.¹⁵¹ For such critiques to be successful, however, they must engage with the literary-critical aspect of Kloppenborg's stratigraphical argument (which they largely do not), namely, the identification of the formative sapiential stratum by virtue of a corroborative comparison with Instruction, not by the mere subtraction of prophetic units of tradition.¹⁵² Nevertheless, the ease with which such critics muster a corpus of Hellenistic-Jewish literature to show the thematic coherence of wisdom and apocalyptic reveals a vulnerability in Kloppenborg's proposal. His identification of the formative stratum is predicated largely upon comparison with ancient Egyptian Instructions and gives less attention to Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom compositions which on his theory one would think are Q's closest relatives. Subsequent research must focus on these texts.

Kloppenborg proposes a framework genre for the final form of Q and calls for studies devoted to the compositional form and rhetorical effect of the text as it presently stands.¹⁵³ However, his own work focuses largely on uncovering the stratigraphy of

¹⁵¹ John J. Collins, "Generic Compatibility," 184-85; George W. E. Nicklesburg, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion," in *SBLSP* 33, 715-32, esp. 717; Paul Hoffmann, "The Redaction of Q and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch," in *Gospel Behind the Gospels*, 159-98, esp. 186; Horsley, "Wisdom Justified," 736; idem, "Questions about Redactional Strata and the Social Relations Reflected in Q," in *SBLSP* 28, 186-203; Harold W. Attridge, "Reflections on Research into Q," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 223-34, esp. 227.

¹⁵² Horsley does register a protest over Kloppenborg's identification of the formative stratum with Near Eastern Instruction, pointing out that Q's sapiential speeches lack the reference to parental instruction which is a feature of such instructions (Richard A. Horsley, "Logoi Propheton? Reflections on the Genre of Q," in *Future of Early Christianity*, 195-209, esp. 199; also Zeller, "Weisheitliche Grundschrift," 393). Kloppenborg himself raises this issue in *Formation*, 318-19.

¹⁵³ Kloppenborg, introduction to *Shape of Q*, 20.

Q and demonstrating the coherence which binds a given stratum together while differentiating it from other strata. He states:

Significant blocks of Q-sayings are either untouched or only minimally influenced by the motifs of the Deuteronomistic view of God's relation to Israel, the announcement of judgment, and the condemnatory ramifications of Gentile faith [second stratum]. These include Jesus' inaugural sermon (Q 6:20-49); a collection of discipleship and mission sayings (9:57-60 [61-62?]; 10:2-16, 21-24); and instructions on prayer (11:2-4, 9-13), anxiety in the face of persecution (12:2-12) and concern over daily necessities (12:22b-31, 33-34) [first stratum]. No less than the redactional stratum described above, these clusters of sayings also display a coherence in forms, projected audience, and motifs.¹⁵⁴

The question of how the final redaction might have combined previous traditions and new materials in such a way as to implement an integrated rhetorical strategy, while not excluded, is raised less frequently. Like Lührmann, Kloppenborg acknowledges in principle the new rhetorical-hermeneutical combination created by redaction, but in practice stratigraphical differentiations attract most of his attention.¹⁵⁵

Vaage

Vaage proposes changes to the stratigraphical boundaries Kloppenborg draws between Q¹ and Q², moving a significant amount of Kloppenborg's Q² material (7:24b-26, 28a, 33-34; 11:14-20, 24-26, 33-36; 11:39-48, 52; 13:18-21) back into Q¹.¹⁵⁶ The criteria Vaage relies upon for this reconfiguration are a combination of proposed thematic differentia and postulated tensions and seams in the text, correlated with some social history categories. Decisive differences suggesting to Vaage the need to emend Kloppenborg's stratigraphy include: (1) absence of the "this generation" thematic in 11:14-20, 24-26, 33-36; 11:37-48, 52 (Q¹); (2) correspondingly, a non-polarization/dialogue structure (same passages) versus polarization/division in 11:23, 29-32; also 7:31-32,

¹⁵⁴ Kloppenborg, "Antique Instructional Genres," 146.

¹⁵⁵ Kloppenborg, "Tradition and Redaction," 56, 59; see also idem, *Formation*, 99.

¹⁵⁶ Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus' First Followers According to Q* (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1994), 108, 117.

35 (Q²); (3) Son of Man on earth in 7:33-34; 9:57-58 (Q¹) versus Son of Man as celestial judge in other Son of Man sayings (Q²), and concomitantly, present focus versus future focus; (4) John and Jesus equal in 7:24b-26, 28a; 7:33-34; 9:57-58 (Q¹) versus Jesus greater than John in 7:27, 28b (Q²); (5) related to this, the resemblance of John and Jesus to Cynics in 7:33-34; 9:57-58; 11:14-20, 24-26, 33-36; 11:37-48, 52 (Q¹) versus Jesus' messianic status in 7:18-23, 27, 28b (Q²).¹⁵⁷

It is not clear that either Vaage's focused redactional analyses of individual passages (such as 7:31-35) or the correlation of his results with a socio-cultural phenomenon such as Cynicism suffice as indicators for his revised redaction history. Kloppenborg's distribution of the material can claim the support of his genre determination for the formative layer. Vaage by comparison does not explain how, for example, the Woes (11:37-48, 52) taken as a small genre (as opposed to their thematic configuration) might fit into an instructional framework genre, nor does he clarify how the Q 7 units he moves back into the formative stratum (7:24-26, 28a, 33-34) might have fit into the formative stratum of serialized sapiential speeches, which in most respects appear quite well-structured.¹⁵⁸

Vaage's redaction-history judgments are based upon such criteria as "(1) the additive appearance of a saying in its present literary context, and (2) evidence of its belonging to a larger rhetorical strategy throughout the document."¹⁵⁹ The first is vague and as framed a matter of individual judgment lacking clear means of arbitrating divergent opinions. The second articulates Lührmann's indispensable principle of looking for motifs establishing cohesion across and between segments of text, but Vaage's application of it raises some questions. In his analysis of 7:31-35, Vaage adduces coherent explanations for the tradition-history contours of the pericope's constituent parts (7:31-32, 35 redactional; 7:33-34 pre-existing tradition). However, his subsequent assignment of 7:33-34 to Q's formative layer conflicts with his location of confrontive, polarized speech in the second layer, for

¹⁵⁷ See Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 108-120; idem, "Son of Man Sayings in Q," 123-25.

¹⁵⁸ A difficulty acknowledged by Vaage ("Son of Man Sayings," 111, 113).

¹⁵⁹ Vaage, "Son of Man Sayings," 121.

it is hard to see how the deviance-labeling attempts in 7:33-34—a witchcraft accusation—attest to anything if not confrontation and polarization of the deadliest kind. Characterizing 11:14-20, 24-26 as merely lampooning albeit acrimonious critique of the medical establishment similarly under-appraises the deadly animosity and intense social conflict entailed in the deviancy charge of demon possession. The description of the Woes (11:39-48, 52) as a “catena of astute and witty criticism” underestimates the level of conflict implicit in the impurity charges made explicitly or implicitly in 11:39-40, 44, 47-48.¹⁶⁰ Moreover, Vaage’s operative assumption is that large parts of Q display the sort of text which tolerates discontinuities and uneasy juxtaposition of incompatible traditions.¹⁶¹ Finally, though Vaage does not apply this line of analysis, the distribution of chreïc and non-chreïc material, which might supply literary-critical corroboration of his thesis because of the affinities of the chreia with the counter-cultural Cynic ethos,¹⁶² is too random even in Vaage’s reconfiguration of the strata to support his correlated social and redaction history. It is somewhat anomalous that Vaage proposes a cynicized *formative* layer, whereas Kloppenborg’s chreia collection designation for the *second* stratum might be thought to render it the layer displaying the greatest affinity with Cynicism, for the Cynic *Bioi* made heavy use of chreïc presentation.¹⁶³

Boring, Kelber, Horsley

These scholars emphasize the prophetic nature of Q (for Sato, see below) and share the conviction that oral processes are deeply implicated in Q’s formation. In differing degrees they draw on the classical form-critical account of Christian origins and accord-

¹⁶⁰ Vaage, “Son of Man Sayings,” 109-113; *Galilean Upstarts*, 115-18.

¹⁶¹ Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 108, stating with respect to certain juxtaposed Q materials the need for “...recognition of *basic discontinuity*, indeed, *incompatibility*...” (my emphases).

¹⁶² See Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel. The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1993), 115.

¹⁶³ R. Bracht Branham, “Authorizing Humor: Lucian’s *Demonax* and Cynic Rhetoric,” in *The Rhetoric of Pronouncement = Semeia 64*, edited by Vernon K. Robbins (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 33-48, esp. 33, 38-39. See below on Downing, who makes precisely this genre argument.

ingly associate Q with the kind of orality thought to be dominant in primitive Christianity.

Eugene Boring argues that enthusiastic prophets of the earliest Christian communities are responsible for much of the Q material. The wisdom elements of this material serve the prophetic, oracular nature of the text. In the performance of Q the community hears the voice of the living Jesus who is identified with the revelatory figure of transcendent Wisdom.¹⁶⁴ As is the case with Kelber and Horsley, this account has the great merit of recovering the *performance* aspect which Q, even as a written text, would have had in the rhetorical culture of antiquity. This contrasts favorably with the tendency of previous analyses, indebted to accretional, tradition-history models of text formation, to view Q as an autonomous, easily dissected entity detached from vital communication situations.

Though the affinities of Boring's account with the *Kleinliteratur* concept are obvious—formation of a body of tradition in an orality-oriented, enthusiastic community by an anonymous group of prophet-tradents—Boring moves beyond the *Kleinliteratur* model by attempting to define a framework genre for the text, the prophet book, proposing, for example, that the Q Baptism and Temptation are analogous to the calls of the Hebrew prophets. The body of "oracles" which follows with minimal admixture of narrative is likewise analogous to the prophet book genre. This attempt to discover Q's framework genre, however, raises some questions. First, Boring's contrast between the "timeless wisdom" of wisdom books and the immediacy of revelation characteristic of Q does not tell against Q's possible affiliation with wisdom.¹⁶⁵ Both Prov 1-9 and *Sirach* link their wisdom to the Revelatrice Wisdom with *Sirach* likening the inspired sage to the paradigmatic recipient of revelation, the prophet (*Sir* 24; see also *Wis* 7-9, *Ps.-Phoc.* 1-2, and *Golden Verses* 46-48).¹⁶⁶ Hesiod's *Lehrgedicht*

¹⁶⁴ Eugene M. Boring, *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy and the Gospel Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 232-33.

¹⁶⁵ Boring, *Continuing Voice*, 232.

¹⁶⁶ Markus Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*, WUNT 2.36 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1990), 59; Oda Wischmeyer, *Die Kultur des Buches Jesus Sirach*, BZNW 77 (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1995), 6-7; Celia Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke. Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25-30*, JSNTSuppl. 18 (Sheffield: JSOT Press,

the *Works and Days* “glorifies the poet’s mission by showing him as an inspired prophet guided by the Muses....”¹⁶⁷ Books such as Qoheleth, while using the wisdom book form, nevertheless call in question the validity of traditional, collective wisdom.¹⁶⁸ Second, Boring alleges that the “timeless wisdom” of wisdom books is only “incidentally attached to a figure of the past: Solomon, Ahikar, Sirach.”¹⁶⁹ However, the wisdom of *Sirach*, though rooted in tradition, is closely linked to Ben Sira’s persona as the inspired sage. Thomas states that “Ben Sira...mit der Erbe israelitischer Spruchtradition das hellenistische Vorbild der selbstbewußten Verfasserpersönlichkeit verbunden hat.”¹⁷⁰ Qoheleth moves the authority and personality of the individual sage decisively into the foreground; the same can be said of Hesiod in the much earlier *Works and Days* who like Sirach presents traditional wisdom.¹⁷¹ The chreia, well attested in Q, is a form predicated upon the importance of the teacher. Similarly the wisdom of Q is attached to the sage-figure, Jesus. Aphoristic wisdom cannot but be connected with the individuality of a particular sage who calls in question the conventional order supported by collective wisdom.¹⁷² Also problematic is Boring’s method of demonstrating the prophetic nature of Q. He analyzes the sayings individually and determines that twenty-two percent originated as oracles of Christian prophets while another twenty-six percent are traditional sayings reformulated under their influence, giving a total of forty-nine per cent of Q material directly attributable to the influence of Christian prophets.¹⁷³ Even if Boring’s figures were accepted, his proce-

1987), 56, 59, 64, 107. On the “inspired scribe” see David E. Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*, JSNTSuppl. 25 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 49, 74, 78-79.

¹⁶⁷ Kasimierz Kumaniecki, “The Structure of Hesiod’s *Works and Days*,” *ICSB* 10 (1963) 79-96, esp. 93.

¹⁶⁸ James G. Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs: Aphoristic Thinking and Biblical Literature* (Sheffield: Almond, 1981), 27-28.

¹⁶⁹ Boring, *Continuing Voice*, 232.

¹⁷⁰ Johannes Thomas, *Der jüdische Phokylides. Formgeschichtliche Zugänge zu Pseudo-Phokylides und Vergleich mit der neutestamentlichen Paränese*, NTOA 23 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 245.

¹⁷¹ Williams, *Proverbs*, 27-28, 49; Julia Kerschensteiner, “Zu Aufbau und Gedankenführung von Hesiods Erga,” *Hermes* 78-79 (1943-44) 149-91, esp. 154, 190.

¹⁷² Williams, *Proverbs*, 80-81.

¹⁷³ Boring, *Continuing Voice*, 231.

dure of using percentages of small genres to draw inferences about the framework genre is questionable. As we shall see below, the relationship between a framework genre and constituent small genres can be quite complex.

Werner Kelber's depiction of Q likewise reflects the social history of primitive Christianity posited by the *Kleinliteratur* model. According to Kelber, Q is the product of the anonymous, unlettered, and enthusiastic Christian community unconcerned with history or the earthly Jesus. Q functioned in a setting of oral performance of Jesus' words; its textualization facilitated repeated oral performance. As such (and this is the problematic inference) it displays only primitive catchword and thematic composition. Kelber identifies the crystallizing redaction of Q with Matthew's and Luke's appropriation of it, thus eliminating the Q redactor as a figure of any significance.¹⁷⁴

While his positioning of the text within a setting of performance constitutes a crucial recalibration within Q research, Kelber's model for the formation of Q and its problems are familiar; his innovation is to put it into the service of special theories about the relationship between orality and textuality within the context of putative conflicts within early Christianity.¹⁷⁵ We shall see that Kelber severely underestimates the literary stylization present in Q.¹⁷⁶ Finally, Kelber's hermetical sealing-off of oral from literary culture in Palestine is improbable, especially when his theory requires us to imagine this state of affairs continuing until the destruction of Jerusalem.¹⁷⁷ Kelber has since adopted the more plausible view of a rhetorical, scribal culture (Robbins' terms), in which orality interacts with textuality.¹⁷⁸ Because scribes

¹⁷⁴ Kelber, *Oral and Written Gospel*, 16-23, 80, 182, 201-202.

¹⁷⁵ See John Halverson, "Oral and Written Gospel: A Critique of Werner Kelber," *NTS* 40 (1994) 180-95.

¹⁷⁶ Kloppenborg, "Antique Instructional Genres," 143.

¹⁷⁷ Kelber, *Oral and Written Gospel*, 211; see Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 10.

¹⁷⁸ Werner Kelber, "Jesus and Tradition: Words in Time, Words in Space," in *Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature = Semeia 65*, edited by Joanna Dewey (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 139-68, esp. 158-60; see Vernon K. Robbins, "Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures: A Response," in *Orality and Textuality*, 75-91, Paul J. Achtemeier, "Omne Verbum Sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Antiquity," *JBL* 109 (1990) 3-27, esp. 4-5, Bernard Brandon Scott, "Blowing in the Wind: A Response," in *Orality and Textuality*, 181-91, and John Miles Foley, "Words in Tradition, Words in Text: A Response," in *Orality and Textuality*, 169-79.

were the main agents of writing within this rhetorical culture, scribal involvement in the composition of Q must now be acknowledged as a distinct possibility without thereby abandoning the notion of its oral performance.

Like Boring and Kelber, Horsley locates the matrix of Q's formation in community settings of oral performance in which Q materials fulfilled a variety of hortatory and instructional functions. Q preserves a frequently performed oral "repertoire of the principal spokespersons of a movement." However, from the sound premise of Q's oral performance Horsley draws the questionable inferences that Q material remained "fluid" and "developing" through "joining discourse to discourse," that Q's origins lie among unlettered, rural people (to be sure, accurate as a tradition-history judgment), and that its formative history knows nothing of literary, scribal activity.¹⁷⁹

Horsley sets Q's formation within a concrete socio-cultural setting. Yet he offers basically a *Kleinliteratur* account of Q's milieu of origin, which permits him to sweep aside the question of literary genre and quite unnecessarily to oppose literary production to oral performance: "Yet we may be attributing more significance to the catalytic role of genre in 'composition' than warranted for material which was regularly functioning in a milieu of oral communication."¹⁸⁰ Horsley derives his characterization of Q from an *a priori* definition of its rustic milieu of origin. The logic should move in the opposite direction: the clues to Q's creation *as a text* are to be found in analysis of its modes of composition.¹⁸¹ As it is, *even wholly textless oral performances are keyed to genre conventions.*¹⁸² An oral composition could receive structuration (for example, associative juxtapositions; extended ring arrangements) which might easily pass into its subsequent textualiza-

¹⁷⁹ Horsley, "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 175-209, esp. 179; idem, "Wisdom Justified," 738-39, 745-50.

¹⁸⁰ Horsley, "Wisdom Justified," 739.

¹⁸¹ Literary formation does not at all preclude the possibility of vital direct connections to the "little tradition."

¹⁸² Roger D. Abrahams, "Genre Theory and Folkloristics," in *Folk Narrative Research*, edited by Juha Pentikäinen and Tuula Juurikka, Studia Fennica: Review of Finnish Linguistics and Ethnology 20 (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura; Finnish Literature Society, 1976), 13-19, esp. 18; Dan Ben-Amos, "The Concepts of Genre in Folklore," in *Folk Narrative Research*, 30-43, esp. 40.

tion.¹⁸³ Ancient rhetoric undertook genre classifications of and prescribed a complex *dispositio* for oral performances, and such recurrent arrangements could leave their imprint on texts in turn intended for performance.¹⁸⁴ For Horsley the social function of the text fills the text-generative role left vacant by his expulsion of genre considerations, but it is not at all clear that social function alone is an adequate centripetal force with regard to formation of texts. Genre is itself deeply implicated in the social function of texts.

Nevertheless, Horsley adds an important element to the methodology of Q compositional studies, namely, insistence upon discovery of the *social functions* of the text within the community and within the socio-historical context of early first-century Palestine.¹⁸⁵ Analysis should approach the text with this question in mind: what set of social relations, social interests, and social conflicts emerge in the way the motifs of the text are related to one another by virtue of the textual relations established by the composition?

Sato

Sato thoroughly assimilates his account of the formation of the Q materials to the *Kleinliteratur* model, proposing development from small units to larger collections following the course set out by Schürmann, with fluid transitions between stages. No creative authorial personality or personalities can be implicated in the formative process.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸³ P. Walcot, "The Composition of the *Works and Days*," *Revue des études grecques* 74 (1961) 1-19; Joanna Dewey, "Oral Methods of Structuring Narrative in Mark," *Int* 43 (1989) 32-44; Foley, "Words in Tradition," 174; Eric A. Havelock, "Oral Composition in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles," *NLH* 16 (1984) 175-97.

¹⁸⁴ Foley, "Words in Tradition," 174, note 13; Walter J. Ong, *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture* (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1977), 295-96. For a study of Q composition with reference to rhetorical conventions see Shawn Carruth, "Persuasion in Q: A Rhetorical-critical Study of Q 6:20-49," Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1992.

¹⁸⁵ Horsley, "Logoi Propheton," 205-208; idem, "Wisdom Justified," 745; idem, "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q," in *Conflict and Invention*, 37-52.

¹⁸⁶ Sato, *Prophetie*, 32-33, 75.

However, Sato takes the final form of Q to be the result of three successive redactional interventions, each of which tended to attach a large block of material in a linear manner rather than as an overlay upon an earlier stratum. Redaction A consists of Q 3:7-7:28, whose formative setting is interaction with the disciples of John the Baptist.¹⁸⁷ Redaction B consists of Q 9:57-10:24, with a setting in mission.¹⁸⁸ Redaction C consists of 7:31-35 + 10:13-15 + 11:14-32, 49-51; 13:23-35 (“wahrscheinlich”), and possibly 12:2-34 and 17:23-37, and its setting is conflict with Israel. Because of its integrative function, Redaction C can be described as the “Gesamtredaktion.”¹⁸⁹

The bulk of Sato’s analysis, however, is given to arguing that “prophet book” constitutes the framework genre for Q’s final redaction, in a manner which seeks to account for the presence of wisdom forms alongside the determinative prophetic elements. Sato uses the following arguments to subsume various aspects of Q under the prophet book rubric:

(1) *Q-Baptism is the prophet’s call to a prophetic vocation.*¹⁹⁰ Sato argues that this pericope (3:21-22) distinguishes Q from wisdom books, whose sages are not called but “erzogen”, sages whose personalities, moreover, are pushed into the background before the all-encompassing timeless wisdom which they represent.¹⁹¹ However, the significance of the baptism pericope is far from unequivocal; it becomes a “prophet’s call” only if one already assumes that Q is prophecy, which takes us back to square one in the debate about framework genre. Downing, for example, likens it to the call-stories of philosophers (see below). Sages such as Ben Sira (39:6-11) are pointedly presented as endowed with the spirit of wisdom.

(2) *Neither the prophet book nor Q narrate the death of the prophet.*¹⁹² Wisdom books do not necessarily narrate the death of the sage

¹⁸⁷ Sato, *Prophetie*, 35, 389.

¹⁸⁸ Sato, *Prophetie*, 37.

¹⁸⁹ Sato, *Prophetie*, 45. For perceptive criticisms of Sato’s redaction-critical proposals see James M. Robinson, “Die Logienquelle: Weisheit oder Prophetie? Anfragen an Migaku Sato,” *EvT* 53 (1993), 367-89.

¹⁹⁰ Sato, *Prophetie*, 81.

¹⁹¹ Sato, *Prophetie*, 106. For a critique of the latter point see above the discussion of Boring.

¹⁹² Sato, *Prophetie*, 80, 383.

either, so this cannot be taken as an index feature of the prophetic book.

(3) *Prophet books and Q claim revelation; wisdom literature does not.*¹⁹³ The starkness of this assertion can be questioned in the light of some sages' claims to be revelators and filled with the Spirit (*Ps.-Phoc.* 1-2; *Sir* 24; *Wis* 7:7, 27; 9:1-18; *Golden Verses* 46-48) and the high profile even a traditional wisdom book like Proverbs gives to the transcendent figure of Wisdom.

(4) *Q is dominated by prophetic small genres.*¹⁹⁴ It is on this point that Sato really rests his case. He argues that the prophetic *Mikro-gattungen* are the predominant element in Q, accounting for forty-one percent of the units.¹⁹⁵ It is to be doubted, however, that even this high estimate suffices to secure Sato's genre proposal. In Q Jesus speaks out of his own authority. Conspicuous by its absence is a prominent marker of prophetic speech: the messenger formula, "Thus says the Lord," "by which the prophetic word is authorized as the word of God."¹⁹⁶ Though announcements of judgment are certainly present in Q, it is far from clear that either their number or their compositional function supports the assertion that the prophet book constitutes Q's framework genre.

Sato acknowledges the pervasive presence of wisdom *Mikro-gattungen*, but argues that such have been co-opted by the prophetic element (*Prophetisierung*).¹⁹⁷ He tries to show, for example, that the sapiential Sermon is "prophetized" by virtue of its being framed by prophetic material (6:20-23; 6:47-49).¹⁹⁸ However, he candidly acknowledges that the macarism (6:20-23) is not a prophetic but a wisdom genre which only secondarily penetrated the prophetic books.¹⁹⁹ He thus rests his case for the co-option of wisdom by prophecy on a questionable equation of "escha-

¹⁹³ Sato, *Prophetie*, 106.

¹⁹⁴ Sato, *Prophetie*, 299.

¹⁹⁵ Sato, "Weisheit oder Prophetie?" 394. Robinson, "Anfragen an Sato," 374-77, puts it at about one third.

¹⁹⁶ Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*, trans. Hugh Clayton White (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967, reprint, Cambridge: Lutterworth; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 93; see also Robinson, "Anfragen an Sato," 377-78, and Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 56.

¹⁹⁷ Sato, *Prophetie*, 99; idem, "Weisheit oder Prophetie?" 399.

¹⁹⁸ Sato, *Prophetie*, 4.

¹⁹⁹ Sato, *Prophetie*, 249, 251.

tologization" with "prophetization," arguing that where one finds a wisdom statement with eschatological orientation and motivation, it has been "prophetized."²⁰⁰ However, it seems equally legitimate to argue that Q wisdom is being offered in the light of a world view of which eschatology is a central element. Since an eschatological world view is characteristic of much Jewish literature of the Hellenistic and Roman age, it does not work well as a genre indicator.²⁰¹ Sato himself notes that in the Hellenistic period wisdom was increasingly infused with an eschatological spirit.²⁰²

Sato acknowledges that though there was such a thing as a *prophetisches Mahnwort*, none of the Q *Mahnworte* can be classified as such.²⁰³ He also candidly points out several respects in which Q does not correspond to the prophet books. The Jesus of Q is a more exalted figure than the Hebrew prophets and one's relationship to him is decisive for salvation. The prophet books have minimal interest in discipleship and nothing corresponding to a mission of the disciples. No prophet book features two prophets the way Q features Jesus and John. Q contains far more parables and miracle stories than is customary in a prophet book.²⁰⁴

These anomalies show that the explanatory power of Sato's hypothesis is somewhat limited. However, Sato's work makes the juxtaposition of prophetic and sapiential material in Q an ongoing issue which, if Q is taken seriously as a communicative artifact, cannot be resolved merely by adducing a stratigraphy. Sato's undertaking has the great virtue of striving toward an integrated reading of Q under the rubric of an encompassing framework genre. He thus takes Q seriously as a *text* linked to a socio-historical communication situation in which it would have been performed and received. While Sato's claim that Q's wisdom elements have been co-opted by the proposed prophetic framework genre is difficult to sustain, his efforts to cope with the implications of their compositional relations in the present form of the text represents both an advance and a challenge.²⁰⁵

²⁰⁰ Sato, *Prophetie*, 225; idem, "Weisheit oder Prophetie?" 394-95.

²⁰¹ Sato, "Weisheit oder Prophetie?" 394-95.

²⁰² Sato, *Prophetie*, 208; idem, "Weisheit oder Prophetie?" 369.

²⁰³ Sato, *Prophetie*, 202, 209, 225.

²⁰⁴ Sato, *Prophetie*, 79-85, 94-95.

²⁰⁵ Robinson's adducing of a stratigraphy—in response to Sato—to explain

Downing

F. Gerald Downing questions the soundness of the methodologies used to produce Q stratigraphies, arguing that such apply theological and thematic criteria without the critical controls supplied by knowledge of (a) ancient compositional techniques and (b) the dynamics of the social settings in which ancient texts such as Q were composed and performed. In the absence of such controls, the critic can be easily misled into resolving the diverse thematic or even theological data of a text such as Q into spurious redaction-history strata. Moreover, the discordant distinctiveness of the layers posited by stratigraphical approaches is hard to reconcile with the fact that the text would have been produced, recited and received as a coherent whole. Downing comes to the conclusion that the kinds of scenarios implicit within currently popular stratigraphical theories of Q's formation are difficult to reconcile with what is in fact known of the dynamics of composition and performance of texts in the first century and, accordingly, raises the possibility that we have Q essentially as it was first composed.²⁰⁶

Downing's second major contribution is his literary-critical analysis of the text itself. His comparison of Q with Greco-Roman *Lives* of the philosophers, and more particularly with the Cynic *Lives*, which make use of chreia collections, is an important step away from *Kleinliteratur*-influenced accounts of the origins of early Christian texts.²⁰⁷

Downing uses comparison with the *Lives* to make illuminating proposals about certain aspects of Q, for example, likening the John-Jesus panels at the beginning of Q to the tendency in the *Lives* to present a succession and comparing the Q baptism (3:21-

the present juxtaposition of prophetic and sapiential materials in Q fails to come to grips with the important issue Sato addresses, and his "Sayings Gospel" suggestion for a framework genre ("Anfragen," 385-89) falls far short of the specificity achieved by Sato and as regards genre-criticism is virtually devoid of heuristic value. More fruitful is the kind of methodology Robinson adopted in "LOGOI SOPHON" and employs again in "The *Incipit* of the Sayings Gospel Q," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 75 (1995) 9-33.

²⁰⁶ Downing, "Word Processing," *passim*.

²⁰⁷ F. Gerald Downing, "Quite Like Q: A Genre for 'Q': The 'Lives' of Cynic Philosophers," *Bib* 69 (1988) 196-225, and idem, "A Genre for Q and a Socio-Cultural Context of Q: Comparing Sets of Similarities with Sets of Differences," *JST* 55 (1994) 3-26.

22) with the call stories of philosophers.²⁰⁸ Downing's project, however, is predicated upon certain unexamined albeit widespread views of the nature of Q, namely, that Q is a composite, displaying "little overall organization", of brief, frequently chreiaic units loosely structured using the primitive techniques of catchword, topical association, and formal association.²⁰⁹ This characterization in fact matches the compositional profile of the chreia collections which are the main constituent element of the *Lives*.²¹⁰ However, it assumes rather than demonstrates that Q is in fact arranged in this manner. Downing acknowledges an important respect in which Q's composition manifestly departs from the chreia collection model, namely, its tendency to form longer speeches as contrasted with the short chreiaic presentations characteristic of the collections.²¹¹ To this can be added that though chreiaic constructions make a strong showing in Q, they are not nearly so pervasive as they are in the *Lives*. Moreover in the *Lives* "reine Sätzen, die situationslos Sprüche bringen, sind nicht vorhanden; es fehlen auch Gleichnisse...."²¹² Q, by contrast, is replete with such forms which in many cases have only a remote connection to any chreiaic introduction. Finally, virtually absent from Q is the frequent *ephe* or *elege* introduction to the sayings of the philosopher in the *Lives*.

Downing acknowledges these areas of divergence, but seeks to compensate by appealing to motifs common to Q and the Cynic *Lives*.²¹³ In fact appeal to characteristic motifs is a legitimate way to establish genre, since certain motif and semantic field configurations may be native to certain genres. However, such argumentation is most convincing when it proceeds in tandem with

²⁰⁸ Downing, "Genre for Q," 6 (footnoting Diogenes Laertius, *Lives*, 6,1-2, 20-21, 82, 87); idem, "Quite Like Q," 201.

²⁰⁹ Downing, "Word Processing," 46; see also idem, "Genre for Q," 11-12, and idem, "Quite like Q," 200, 202.

²¹⁰ Hubert Cancik, "Bios und Logos. Formengeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Lukians 'Demonax,'" in *Markus-Philologie. Historische, literargeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Evangelium*, WUNT 33, ed. Hubert Cancik (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1984), 115-30, esp. 121-24; Gunnar Rudberg, "Zur Diogenes-Tradition," *SO* 14 (1935) 22-43, esp. 25, 37-42.

²¹¹ Downing, "Genre for Q," 7; see Rudberg, "Tradition," 29, 32, and Cancik, "Bios," 122-23.

²¹² Cancik, "Bios," 122-23, referring to Lucian's *Demonax*.

²¹³ Downing, "Quite Like Q," 200-203, 218-19; idem, "Genre for Q," 15, 25.

demonstration of form-critical similarity. Appeal to common motifs does not succeed as a genre determinant in the face of (and as an attempted compensation for) unsatisfactory results from analysis of formal-compositional characteristics. Moreover, while some of Downing's motif parallels are apposite, others seem more remote.²¹⁴ These at best mixed results from both the form and content perspectives indicate that while there may indeed be areas of generic similarity between Q and the *Lives* (most impressive here is Q's repeated use of the chreiaic form), a better match for Q's framework genre might be found elsewhere.

Mack

Mack is representative of a group of scholars who reject the notion that the sayings clusters in Q are the result of aggregation or primitive thematic association. Mack argues instead that they are units of argumentation composed in accordance with the chreia elaboration model set forth in the Greco-Roman handbooks of rhetoric. Mack states (referring to Q 12:22-31): "Scholars have usually regarded such a block as a cluster of independent, free-floating sayings collected by thematic association. The rhetorical approach looks for a unit of argumentation."²¹⁵ This resort to the chreia elaboration model assists in the recovery of Q as a *performed* text functioning communicatively in a rhetorical culture.²¹⁶

²¹⁴ For example, Downing deals with the problem presented by Q's exorcism and healing stories (7:1-10; 11:14), which are unparalleled in the Cynic stories and even run contrary to Cynic "skepticism about supposed divine intervention" ("Quite Like Q" 210), by invoking the Cynic belief that good health is a benefit of the Cynic regimen. Other alleged parallels, such as the critique of wealth, servant and master illustrations, and the Two Ways motif are so ubiquitous in Mediterranean wisdom literature that it seems precarious to make their appearance in Q an indicator of its Cynic ethos. It is not clear that Downing's adducing of the occasional Cynic appeal to individualized judgment and Stoic eschatology resolves the problem of the manifest eschatology in the final sections of Q ("Quite Like Q" 218).

²¹⁵ Burton L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 50-51. See also George Wesley Buchanan, "Chreias in the New Testament," in *Logia*, 501-505, esp. 504.

²¹⁶ In *Lost Gospel* Mack attempts a social history of the Q community, based upon Kloppenborg's stratification, expanding, however, Kloppenborg's three strata into five stages. Mack extracts a list of aphorisms ("terse sayings") from

Mack's attention to the composition of the small speeches has some important antecedents. Zeller isolates a pattern repeated in several Q clusters consisting of an opening thematic imperative + a "Mittelstück" consisting of rhetorical questions + a cumulative concluding statement.²¹⁷ Kloppenborg notes the resemblances of Q's sapiential speeches to some of the compositions found in *Sirach* and the Egyptian instructions, visible in the tendency to begin a speech with a programmatic imperative then developed in the main body of the speech.²¹⁸ Klaus Berger isolates a genre which he designates "argumentation" consisting of "Verbindung und Integration mehrerer untergeordneter Formen mit einem Schlußsatz. Der Zielsatz am Ende summiert das vorher in der zielgerichteten Kette Vorbereitete."²¹⁹

From descriptions of the *progymnasmata* ("preliminary exercises"; classroom exercises for aspiring rhetors), Mack derives the following pattern: (1) *thesis* or *proposition*, consisting of a *chreia* or *maxim*, frequently cast in figurative or enigmatic language; (2) *reason* or *rationale*, decoding the *chreia* or *maxim*, giving a fundamental justification for its truth, and restating it in a declarative form capable of being argued. This threshold combination of *thesis* + *rationale* forms the basic argument, which is then elaborated with (3) a *short chain of stock argumentative maneuvers*. These could include argument from analogy, argument from the contrary, argument from example, and argument from authority. The final

Kloppenborg's Q¹ which he makes the social-history and redaction-history bedrock upon which the sapiential arguments of Q¹ supposedly are built, aphorisms allegedly representing the culture-critical, Cynic-like ethos of the earliest Jesus movement (109-111). Mack's redaction-critical, literary-critical reasons for precipitating out and assigning priority to these aphorisms are at best obscure. Despite his claim that the arguments of the sayings clusters are built around them ("core sayings"), they occur in those clusters in all kinds of different and not necessarily dominant compositional positions. Apart from the rhetorical environment given them by their actualization within their respective clusters, that is, taken as they stand in Mack's isolated list, they are vacuous, vague floaters lacking the pungency Mack actually projects upon them only by virtue of his commentary on page 111. In fact Mack uses the proposed Cynic-like ethos as a literary-critical tool to define this layer, another case of a privileged social history creating a certain redaction-history.

²¹⁷ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 142.

²¹⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 317-18.

²¹⁹ Klaus Berger, *Exegese des Neuen Testaments. Neue Wege vom Text zur Auslegung*, UTB 658 (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1977), 54. See also Terence Y. Mullins, "Topos as a New Testament Form," *JBL* 99 (1980) 541-47.

step is (4) the *conclusion*.²²⁰ A proposed example of Q's use of this pattern is 12:22-31: *thesis*: "Do not be anxious..."; *rationale*: "For life is more than food and the body than clothing"; *chain of supportive argumentation*: analogy from nature + rhetorical question (verse 24); gnomic rhetorical question (verse 25); analogy from nature + rhetorical question (verses 27-28); *concluding exhortations* (verses 29-31).²²¹ Mack emphasizes that this pattern, devised by rhetorical instructors for classroom exercises, should not be understood as a rigid generic template. Rather, it can be used heuristically to analyze rhetorical maneuvers in a wide variety of compositions containing deliberative argumentation.²²²

The usefulness of the chreia elaboration pattern for understanding Q composition is already indicated by the appearance of several chreias in Q to which are attached more or less extended elaborations. However, some questions arise in connection with its application to Q which urge caution. A number of Q speeches show significant deviations from the elaborative pattern. Rees Conrad Douglas notes that some sayings clusters, including 12:22-31, begin with *admonitions*, not with a chreia or maxim.²²³ Another difference is that some Q sayings Mack would identify as the "rationale" do not clearly fulfill the function the handbooks assign to the rationale, namely, to translate the figurative language of the maxim or chreia into the plain language of a proposition.²²⁴ Not infrequently the second element in Q sayings-clusters is itself a metaphorical and even enigmatic maxim (see below, chapter three). This suggests that other conventions may have exerted influence upon the formation of the clusters.

Mack explains the presence of the chreia elaboration pattern

²²⁰ Mack, *Rhetoric*, 42-43; idem, "Elaboration of the Chreia in the Hellenistic School," in Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1989), 31-67, esp. 56-61. See Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, eds., *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, vol 1, *The Progymnasmata*, SBLTT 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

²²¹ See also Rees Conrad Douglas, "Family, Power, Religion: A Discussion of the Background and Functions of References to God as Father in the Gospel of Matthew," Dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1990.

²²² Mack, "Elaboration of the Chreia," 49, 63-64.

²²³ Douglas, "Family, Power, Religion," 178.

²²⁴ Quintilian IV.v. 26 states, "The *proposition*, whether single or multiple, must, on every occasion when it can be employed with profit, be clear and lucid; for what could be more discreditable than that a portion of the speech, whose sole purpose is to prevent obscurity elsewhere, should itself be obscure?"

in Q from the fact of the dispersion of Greco-Roman “high culture...throughout the Greco-Roman world.” The presence of Greek urban foundations in the Levant leads “to the conclusion that Greek culture had firmly taken root throughout the eastern Mediterranean....Greek culture (*paideia*) and public education (*paideia*) were one and the same.”²²⁵ These facts are indisputable and critically important; however, Mack and others, in their correct estimation of the powerful, even hegemonic influence of Greek culture (and with it Greek rhetoric) in non-Greek lands, tend to underestimate the strength of the native cultures of the eastern Mediterranean and overlook the reciprocal exchange which was an essential element in the encounter of these ancient cultures with Hellenism. This in turn leads to a questionable narrowing of the literary-critical comparative base to the models supplied by the Greco-Roman handbooks.²²⁶ Identifying Hellenistic literary-rhetorical culture with Greco-Roman literary-rhetorical culture leads to neglect of other relevant literatures, such as Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom texts. As a corrective to this tendency the following principles should be kept in mind:

(1) Hellenistic culture was a *fusion* of Greek and Near Eastern cultures. Martin Nilsson refers to “den gesteigerten Verkehr zwischen allen Völkern und die Vermischung ihrer Kulturen und Ideen” in the Hellenistic world. “Im geistigen und religiösen Leben begegnen sich verschiedene, von innen und außen kommende Ideen und Strömungen, kreuzen sich, bekämpfen einander und verschmelzen miteinander.”²²⁷ Textual artifacts produced in this cultural environment, as was Q, might well present a compositional profile which combines Near Eastern and Greco-Roman literary and rhetorical patterns.

²²⁵ Mack, *Rhetoric*, 29-30.

²²⁶ Heinz Guenther states baldly that “all of Q’s literary genres...have their Hellenistic counterparts in, and are modeled on, Greek archetypes” (“The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for Aramaic Sources,” in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 41-76, esp. 62).

²²⁷ Martin P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*, vol 2, *Die Hellenistische und Römische Zeit*, 2nd ed. (München: Ch. H. Beck’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), 16-17. See also M. L. West, “Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature,” *HSClPh* 73 (1969), 113-34, esp. 114 (“the Orontes flowed into the Tiber”), and Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 1.104-105, 252, 310.

(2) Palestine had a rich scribal wisdom tradition with roots in the Ancient Near East, extending far back into pre-exilic times and sustained throughout the Hellenistic and Roman age.²²⁸ This literary tradition may have influenced the formation of Q; hence, one should study literary genres native to the Ancient Near East as well as those of Greco-Roman literature.²²⁹

(3) Greco-Roman literary and rhetorical genres were indeed assimilated in Palestine.²³⁰ Therefore, one should not commit the opposite error of being caught up in the Ancient Near Eastern materials to the neglect of the Greco-Roman materials. The Q literary critic should forage among all the related groups of ancient wisdom literature.

(4) Cross-cultural appropriation of genres entailed transformation of those genres.²³¹ Where one finds a Greco-Roman genre

²²⁸ Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.78, 113, 247-58.

²²⁹ Henry A. Fischel, "Story and History: Observations on Greco-Roman Rhetoric and Pharisaism," in *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*, ed. Henry A. Fischel (New York: KTAV, 1977), 443-72, esp. 472. See also Walter T. Wilson, *Love Without Pretence. Romans 12.9-21 and Hellenistic-Jewish Literature*, WUNT 2.46 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1991) 3, 6, and Wilhelm Wuellner, "Biblical Exegesis in the Light of the History and Historicity of Rhetoric and the Nature of the Rhetoric of Religion," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, JSNTSuppl 90 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 492-513, esp. 498.

²³⁰ Fischel, "Story and History," 443-72; idem, "Studies in Cynicism and the Ancient Near East: The Transformation of a *Chria*," in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, ed. Jacob Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 372-411; idem, "The Transformation of Wisdom in the World of Midrash," in *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Robert L. Wilken (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), 67-101; idem, "The Uses of Sorites (Climax, Gradatio) in the Tannaitic Period," *HUCA* 44 (1973) 119-151; David Daube, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," *HUCA* 22 (1949) 239-65.

²³¹ Klaus Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament," in *ANRW* II. 25.2, 1031-1432, esp. 1040; John G. Gammie, "The Hellenization of Jewish Wisdom in the Letter of Aristeeas," in *Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 4-12, 1985, Division A: The Period of the Bible* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1986), 207-14; Nikolaus Walter, "Jewish-Greek Literature of the Greek Period," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 2, *The Hellenistic Age*, eds. W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 385-408, esp. 408; Wilhelm Wuellner, "The Rhetorical Genre of Jesus' Sermon in Luke 12.1-13.9," in *Persuasive Artistry. Studies in the New Testament in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Duane F. Watson, JSNTSuppl 50 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 93-118, esp. 116; Hans-Peter Müller, "Formgeschichte/Formenkritik. Altes Testament," *TRE* 11 (1983) 271-85, esp. 283;

in Jewish literature, one should be alert for modifications which have reshaped it in accordance with both the ideals and patterns of the borrowing culture.

(5) The Ancient Near East exerted both an early and on-going influence upon the development of Greco-Roman literary and rhetorical genres.²³² This influence is pronounced in the case of Near Eastern wisdom genres and Greco-Roman wisdom genres.

(6) The appearance in Q of rhetorical-argumentative techniques discussed in the Greek and Roman rhetorical handbooks may be but is not necessarily an indicator of direct influence. Quintilian himself states that rhetorical theoreticians did not create the rules of effective rhetoric, but collected and systematized conventions long in use; nevertheless, the Greco-Roman rules of rhetoric gave a specific and to be sure highly influential formulation to the functions of persuasive argumentation.²³³

In sum, Q sayings clusters should be studied on their own terms as performances of a form of deliberative discourse widespread in the ancient Mediterranean world, not squeezed to fit one species of that type of discourse preserved in the handbooks or in any other narrowly defined corpus.²³⁴ Narrow appeal to

Daube, "Rabbinic Methods," 258-59; Fischel, "Story and History," 469-70; idem, "Transformation of a *Chria*," 374-75; Alan J. Avery-Peck, "Rhetorical Argumentation in Early Rabbinic Pronouncement Stories," in *Rhetoric of Pronouncement*, 49-69, esp. 68-69.

²³² West, "Near Eastern Material," 113-34; P. Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1966), 86, 96. Walter Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*, trans. Margaret E. Pindar and Walter Burkert (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), states: "The 'miracle of Greece'....also owes its existence to the simple phenomenon that the Greeks are the most easterly of the Westerners" (129).

²³³ Quintilian V.x.120-21. See Avery-Peck, "Rabbinic Pronouncement Stories," 68-69, Joachim C. Classan, "St. Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 265-91, esp. 290-91, and Jeffrey T. Reed, "Using Ancient Rhetorical Categories to Interpret Paul's Letters: A Question of Genre," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 292-324, esp. 322.

²³⁴ See Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*, HUT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1991), 8-9, who recommends comparative resort to actual speeches rather than solely to the handbooks; also Lou H. Silberman, "Schoolboys and Storytellers: Some Comments on Aphorisms and *Chriae*," in *Kingdom and Children = Semeia* 29, ed. Daniel Patte (Chico, Calif: Scholars Press, 1983), 109-115, esp. 109-110, A. H. Snyman, "Persuasion in Philipians 4.1-20," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 325-37, esp. 335, Rolf Knierim, "Old Testament

the *progymnasmata* model or any other rhetorical *dispositio* runs the risk of committing the "Archetypus" fallacy and of making compositional analysis depend upon a deductive and even coercive application of one model to reluctant materials, which should rather be studied inductively as performancial variations of a perhaps less determinate genre configuration.²³⁵

Piper

Taken together with Mack's work on the chreia elaboration, Ronald Piper's analysis of the compositional structure of the sayings clusters marks a crucial advance in Q research. Through an inductive analysis of several Q clusters (6:27-35; 11:9-13; 12:2-12; 12:22-31), Piper proposes a recurring compositional pattern. Each cluster opens with (1) a *general aphoristic saying*, followed by (2) a *general maxim* in close support of the opening aphorism. The opening combination of general maxim + supporting maxim articulates the programmatic theme for the cluster. However, as is the nature of maxims, they remain hermeneutically open. Hence they are followed by (3) *two rhetorical questions which employ striking images* from nature or daily life *illustrating* the principle set forth by the two opening maxims and *narrowing* their range of application to a specific issue. The cluster culminates with (4) a *concluding saying* which draws together the argument of the cluster and gives it a *specific application* to the community. Closure is signaled by its forming an *inclusio* with the opening maxims.²³⁶ Thus the pattern evinces both a linear elaboration moving from general saying to specific application, and a structural balance coordinating opening with conclusion. Q 11:9-13 displays this pattern with particular clarity: (1) *opening maxim*: "Ask and it shall be given to you, seek and you shall find, knock..."; (2) *supportive maxim*: "For whoever asks receives, and whoever seeks finds, and to whomever knocks..."; (3) *two illustrative rhetorical questions*: "What

Form Criticism Reconsidered," *Int* 27 (1973) 435-68, esp. 461, and Steven J. Kraftchick, "Why do the rhetoricians rage?" in *Text and Logos: The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament*, ed. Theodore W. Jennings Jr. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 55-79.

²³⁵ See Klaus W. Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie. Information und Synthese*, UTB 133 (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1973), 128-33.

²³⁶ Piper, *Wisdom*, 35-36, 61-63, 72-73, 193.

father among you, who, when his son asks for bread....?" (4) *concluding community application*: "If you then, being selfish...how much more will your Heavenly Father give good things to those who ask him?"²³⁷

Piper does not rely on theological or thematic criteria to reconstruct this pattern of redaction. Motif considerations play a supporting role—the cluster above is obviously about prayer—but the operative criteria are structural and form- and composition-critical. The inference Piper draws is surely correct: this compositional pattern lays down unimpeachable evidence for literary and scribal activity behind the formation of at least these sayings-clusters; they did not aggregate over time by means of primitive connective techniques.²³⁸

However, Piper's model has limitations with respect to its explanatory power, for he is unable to extend it to Q clusters other than those he analyzes; moreover there are some anomalies in the clusters he does study. For example, 11:2-4 (also double tradition) is obviously related to the prayer exhortations of 11:9-13, and its proximity thereto is surely no accident, yet Piper's model is unable to incorporate it into the compositional design governing 11:9-13. Furthermore, Piper is less successful in locating a similar model in other wisdom literature.²³⁹ These two problems taken together suggest that the model might benefit by some emendations which will increase its range of application within Q and permit its classification with compositional models broadly attested in other ancient wisdom literature.

Sevenich-Bax

Elisabeth Sevenich-Bax appeals for a synchronic reading of the present form of Q. Regardless of whatever redaction history or tradition history the Q materials may have passed through, in

²³⁷ David R. Catchpole, "The Law and the Prophets in Q," in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament. Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne with Otto Betz (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1987) 95-109, proposes a recurrent compositional pattern for Q 6:27-35; 11:2-13; 12:22-31 which bears some similarity to Piper's: "...a heading, a pair of illustrative arguments, and a concluding summary" (98).

²³⁸ Piper, *Wisdom*, 12-14, 64, 68, 161.

²³⁹ Piper, *Wisdom*, 66-68.

its present form ("Endredaktion") Q is a "synchrone Gestalt" which "eine sinnvolle Aussage macht."²⁴⁰ Correspondingly, Sevenich-Bax criticizes bifurcated tradition-redaction readings of Q for failing to appreciate the degree to which redaction appropriates and assimilates previous traditions and redactions within a new, coherent act of communication: "Die *Endgestalt* eines Textes die Entwicklungsphasen seiner Teile immer schon umfaßt."²⁴¹ Sevenich-Bax also questions the too quick assumption that perceived tensions between units of tradition indicate seams between redaction and tradition or between strata, arguing that the same phenomenon can result from editorial juxtaposition of heterogeneous traditions.²⁴²

Sevenich-Bax recognises that the compositional form (*Gestalt*) of a text affects the significance of its constituent parts; hence she consigns thematic and theological redaction-history criteria to second rank. Her major criteria for discovering the compositional attributes of the text are indebted to text-linguistics. A large section of text (Sevenich-Bax examines Q 3-7) must be broken down into the smaller compositional units which constitute it. This "Untergliederung" is carried out by observing the linguistic devices ("Kohärenzfaktoren") a text uses to manufacture its compositional structure. These include (1) semantic factors such as repetitions of key words ("Stichwortbezüge [Rekurrenz]") and the presence of synonyms or antonyms which indicate significant equivalencies or oppositions and serve to mark out sections of text, (2) syntactic factors, such as conjunctions and pronominalization, (3) shifts in episodes, actors, and mode of speech, and (4) hierarchies of speech-acts.²⁴³

Sevenich-Bax's application of these criteria leads her to propose a macro-structuration for Q 3-7 which our analysis in chap-

²⁴⁰ Elisabeth Sevenich-Bax, *Israels Konfrontation mit den letzten Boten der Weisheit: Form, Funktion und Interdependenz der Weisheitselemente in der Logienquelle*, MThA 21 (Altenberge: Oros, 1993), 18, 339. See also Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 36-38, 170, who like Sevenich-Bax argues for a synchronic reading of the final form of Q; see also idem, "Q: Rekonstruktion und Interpretation: Eine methodenkritische Hinführung mit einem Exkurs zur Q-Vorlage des Lk," *FZPhTh* 36 (1989) 409-25, esp. 413-14, 421, and idem, "Q und Jesus," *BZ* 36 (1992) 30-58, esp. 36-37.

²⁴¹ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 20.

²⁴² Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 108.

²⁴³ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 13-26, 258.

ter four will corroborate.²⁴⁴ However, she is less interested in the question of how her findings might conform to ancient compositional techniques and genres (with the exception of 3:7-9, 16-17, which she attempts to explain as an example of a *Lehrrede*), leaving her structural theory lacking a context in the ancient setting in which Q was shaped. Also, it is doubtful that an ahistorical linguistic text-analysis, productive though it may be in many respects, is capable of discovering all aspects of Q's compositional configuration (and may even run the danger of distorting them), working, as it does, in isolation from knowledge of ancient genres and compositional conventions employed by ancient scribes.²⁴⁵

Results and Considerations of Method

Viewing Q as a specimen of *Kleinliteratur* has had the effect of isolating Q analysis from the study of antique literary genres and thereby at the outset obstructed, even precluded investigation of the possible literary properties of its text. By laying down as a premise an inchoate, highly diachronized process of formation this approach has generated a number of different redaction-history proposals without supplying decisive means to arbitrate among them. Accordingly, scholars have worked out redaction histories of Q along the lines of privileged theological or social histories with little or no attention given to genre or other compositional conventions at work in the text and, correspondingly, have tended to identify tradition history with redaction history. Not infrequently proposals for the redaction history of Q appear generated by social history trajectories of primitive Christianity, for example, alleged movement from "naive Mündlichkeit der heiligen Rhapsoden" to "Schreibtischarbeit des Exegeten," in which "die Volkstümlichkeit des Anfangs steht in unaufhebbarem Kontrast zu dem, was dann die spätere episkopale Kirche ist," or by

²⁴⁴ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 267; see below, chapter four.

²⁴⁵ See Berger, *Exegese*, 67, 130, and Hans-Dieter Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount. A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49)*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 44, 49, on the problems inherent in ahistorical structural-linguistic analysis uncontrolled by comparative analysis of ancient literature.

other developmental schemes such as movement from low to high christology.²⁴⁶ Often coordinated with such trajectories is the notion of a mission to Israel giving way to a mission to Gentiles. The fact that the latter may roughly represent the course of Christian history says nothing about its usefulness for recovering the redaction history of Q.²⁴⁷ It is not clear why Q's redaction history should be a fossilized witness to such tectonic movements across epochal spans of early Christian social and theological history, however that history may be construed, or why its social-historical scope should not be more focused (but for that reason no less interesting).

Reliance upon such interpretive frameworks is inevitable given the dominant *Kleinliteratur* conception which posited Q as an inchoate, constantly expanding, amorphous collection of traditions, endowed by unlettered redactors with nothing but the most primitive structure. Within such a research regime Q scholars doing redaction histories have had no option but to grasp for whatever social-historical and theological development schemes might be made available to them by current thinking in the field. The lack of literary-critical controls upon such analyses has resulted in a Q compliant with the application of virtually any analytical model.

Throughout our survey "genre" has frequently been invoked as an analytical principle supplying the basis for criticism or approbation of a given scholar's work on Q. It remains now to justify the programmatic status given to genre criticism both above

²⁴⁶ Berger, *Einführung*, 66. Berger notes the reliance of such reconstructions on the "Hilfe des Dekadenzschemas" ("Form- und Gattungsgeschichte," 440). An intriguing permutation of the *Dekadenzschema* appears in Elizabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza, "Jesus—Messenger of Divine Wisdom," *ST* 49 (1995) 231-52. Schüssler-Fiorenza suggests that primitive Q-traditions are characterized by inclusivist, Sophia christology, later redactional additions, particularly 10:21-22, by exclusivist, hierarchical, patriarchal, androcentric christology (242-43). However, we shall argue below (chapter four) that the claim to revelation in 10:21-22 constitutes Jesus' radical, de-legitimizing challenge from the "periphery" to the urban, temple-based elites at the "center" who are in fact the oppressors of the poor—women, men, and children—and hence is a critical element of a fundamental attack on the unjust structures of that society.

²⁴⁷ Hubert Frankemölle, "Evangelist und Gemeinde. Eine methoden-kritische Besinnung mit Beispielen aus dem Mattäus-evangelium," *Bib* 60 (1979) 153-90, esp. 173-74, notes the tendency of such redaction-history schemes to argue in a circle.

and in the analysis to be carried out in subsequent chapters. The following methodological sketch, drawn mostly from discussions of genre in text linguistics (*Textsorten*), but also from folklore, rhetorical criticism, and literary criticism, clarifies the crucial role played by genre in text formation and redaction.²⁴⁸

(1) *Text as a network of hermeneutically significant relations between small units*: Because of classical form criticism's postulate that primitive Christian communities did not move very far beyond the limits of enthusiastic orality to produce well-formed texts, it directed analysis toward constituent small units, thought to be the locus of meaning as well as points of access to an oral period.²⁴⁹ While form criticism valued analysis of genre, or "form", it embedded investigation of such within the *Kleinliteratur* conception of the formation of the synoptic tradition. The present Q text, viewed as an amalgam, beyond some perfunctory redaction did little to confer comprehensive cohesion upon its disparate parts; rather, its alleged aporias and tensions supplied starting points for moving back through its formative process.²⁵⁰ Against this view, proper appraisal is needed of the fact that small units isolated from their context, like words isolated from the sentences in which they occur, are semantically polyvalent. The interrelations of constituent units within a text has in fact an analogy at the level of the sentence in which words, semantically ambiguous taken in isolation, receive specific hermeneutical direction by virtue of their relations with other words, relations set up by the syntactic and grammatical features of the overarching sentence structure. The communicative, linguistic competence which generates sentences has an analogy in text production.²⁵¹ Through various mechanisms text composition estab-

²⁴⁸ The terms "text-types" (text linguistics) and "genre" (literary criticism), though not necessarily synonymous, overlap to a considerable degree; see Christof Hardmeier, *Texttheorie und biblische Exegese. Zur rhetorischen Funktion der Trauermetaphorik in der Prophetie*, BEvT 79 (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1978), 261, note 8, Knierim, "Form Criticism," 463, and Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 15-16. Literary criticism tends to treat high literary genres, whereas text linguistics examines text production in all spheres of social interaction.

²⁴⁹ See Berger, *Einführung*, 165, idem, "Form- und Gattungsgeschichte," 440, Knierim, "Form Criticism," 457-58, 460, note 97, and Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 17.

²⁵⁰ See Scott, "Blowing in the Wind," 181-82, and Knierim, "Form Criticism," 459, note 93.

²⁵¹ Wolfgang Heinemann and Dieter Viehweger, *Textlinguistik: Eine Einführung*

lishes relations of significance among constituent units. This stabilizes and limits hermeneutical polyvalency and to greater or lesser degrees lends a measure of integration to the text as a whole, making it "ein Netz semantischer Relationen," in turn mandating that its individual units be appraised accordingly, though *the question of the degree of coherence and cohesion actually present in a given text must not be begged*.²⁵² "A comprehensive understanding must now also inquire about the structural value of the pericope's place in the new, more complex form, according to the structural and functional context of its place within the whole composition."²⁵³ Victor Turner articulates this principle as applied to the polysemy of symbols used in Ndembu ritual:

If one is looking atomistically at each of these symbols [i.e., the red or white cock], in isolation from one another and from the other symbols in the symbolic field...its multivocality is its most striking feature. If...one is looking at them wholistically in terms of the classifications that structure the semantics of the whole rite in which they occur, then each of the senses allocated to them appears as the exemplification of a single principle....each symbol becomes univocal.²⁵⁴

This principle of text formation justifies the search for mecha-

(Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1991), 26; Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler, *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*, Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 28 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1981), 92; Nils Erik Enkvist, *Linguistic Stylistics* (The Hague & Paris: Mouton, 1973), 112-13; Peter Cotterell and Max Turner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1989), 28-29, 79-80; Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*, 222; Eugene A. Nida and Johannes P. Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*, SBLRBS 25 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 16-18.

²⁵² Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 94; see also de Beaugrande and Dressler, *Einführung*, 92, 117, Knierim, "Form Criticism," 459, note 93, Berger, *Einführung*, 29, 72, idem, *Exegese*, 65, Frankemölle, "Evangelist," 170-71, Wilhelm Egger, *Methodenlehre zum Neuen Testament. Einführung in linguistische und historische-kritische Methoden* (Freiburg; Basel; Wien: Herder, 1987), 29, 74, 93, and B. A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque. Procédés et réalisations*, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1960), 8.

²⁵³ Erhardt Güttgemanns, *Candid Questions Concerning Gospel Form Criticism*, translated by William Doty, PTMS 26 (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1971), 123. See also Schönle, *Johannes, Jesus*, 22, and Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957, 1990), 78.

²⁵⁴ Victor W. Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure* (Chicago: Aldine, 1969), 41-42.

nisms used to create cohesion across longer, "macro" stretches of text made up of a series of smaller units (building here upon Lührmann's methodological initiative). Genre also becomes relevant, for the manner in which parts are related to the whole within a text will be influenced by a set of genre conventions.²⁵⁵

(2) *Text production as a communicative strategy*: Against the prevalent tendency to remove Q from its native location in oral communicative situations in which it would be performed and to dissect it in abstraction, the nature of Q's text as carrying out a communicative, rhetorical strategy must be recovered and foregrounded in analysis: "Texte als Instrumente kommunikativen Handelns zu bestimmen sind."²⁵⁶ Far from being haphazard arrangements, relations between constituent units and the structures which implement them (for example, sequencing) are manifestations of a communicative strategy—the result of a series of conscious decisions—adopted by the person or persons responsible for the production of the text.²⁵⁷ This understanding is all the more requisite in the case of early Christian texts such as Q, which were produced within the oralized, rhetorical culture of antiquity.²⁵⁸

A text, like any other communicative activity, arises and is enacted within an interactive social situation encompassing the producer of the text and its recipients. A text constitutes a specific response to and hence is shaped by the exigencies of a given social situation, with the text itself influencing perceptions of the situation.²⁵⁹ A text comes into existence because its producer

²⁵⁵ Paul Hernadi, *Beyond Genre: New Directions in Literary Classification* (Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1972), 2-3; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 26 (suggesting an analogy between the classification of various types of sentences and the classification of texts in accordance with their various generative models [*Muster*]); Michael Theobald, "Der Primat der Synchronie vor der Diachronie als Grundaxiom der Literarkritik," *BZ* 22 (1978) 161-86, esp. 162; Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*, 140; Fritzleo Lentzen-Deis, "Methodische Überlegungen zur Bestimmung literarischer Gattungen im Neuen Testament," *Bib* 52 (1981) 1-20, esp. 15.

²⁵⁶ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 56-57, 65; Kelber, "Jesus and Tradition," 140-41; see also Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 66-67, and de Beaugrande & Dressler, *Textlinguistik*, 3-5, 60.

²⁵⁷ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 92, 213-17, 221, 224; Knierim, "Form Criticism," 467.

²⁵⁸ Achtemeier, "Omne Verbum Sonat," 19.

²⁵⁹ Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *PhilRhet* 1 (1968) 1-14; Alan Brinton, "Situation in the Theory of Rhetoric," *PhilRhet* 14 (1981) 234-48; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 63.

wants to achieve a certain goal—has a communicative intention—with respect to influencing a set of recipients similarly enmeshed in the social situation. Hence the multitude of compositional choices going into production of a text in all of its specifics is governed by the communicative intention and the desire of the producer to achieve a certain effect upon its recipients, that is, the text in all of its details enacts a communicative strategy.²⁶⁰ While it is not possible to attribute perfect coherence to any text, the location of text production within interactive communicative situations entails that texts possess the property of intelligibility and hence manifest a *proclivity* towards coherence and cohesion: “Daher werden nicht-kommunikative Texte als Nicht-Texte behandelt.”²⁶¹

(3) *Text production as implementation of genre conventions*: Genres are patterns for structuring communication acts—and hence generative templates for executing communicative, rhetorical strategies—which have achieved conventional status because of the recurrent and diverse nature of various communication tasks, occurring within various social settings, addressed within a particular society.²⁶² As socially and culturally inculcated linguistic *conventions*, genres form part of the cognitive apparatus of text recipients as well as producers, though here an important distinction exists between “active” and “passive” genre competence.²⁶³ Hence genre

²⁶⁰ Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 65-66, 94; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 89, 211, 214-15; Theobald, “Primat,” 162-63; Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 34-38, 133-35; Berger, *Einführung*, 139-40; Dale Patrick and Allen Scult, *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation*, JSOTSuppl 82, Bible and Literature Series 26 (Sheffield: Almond, 1990), 13; Barbara Sandig, “Textsortenbeschreibung unter dem Gesichtspunkt einer linguistischen Pragmatik,” in *Textsorten und literarische Gattungen. Dokumentation des Germanistentages in Hamburg von 1. bis 4. April 1979* (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1983), 91-102, esp. 91.

²⁶¹ de Beaugrande & Dressler, *Textlinguistik*, 3; see also Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 67, 71.

²⁶² Carolyn R. Miller, “Genre as Social Action,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984) 151-67, passim; Carol Berkenkotter and Thomas N. Huckin, *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power* (Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995), 4-24; Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 102-104, 286; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 134 (“Realisierung eines Kommunikationstyps”), 144, 154; Jackson Harrell and Wil A. Linkugel, “On Rhetorical Genre: An Organizing Perspective,” *PhilRhet* 11 (1978) 262-81, passim.

²⁶³ Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 103; Abrahams, “Genre Theory,” 16-17; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 111, 130-31; Berkenkotter & Huckin, *Genre Knowledge*, 7, 11. See also Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 95-96, on genres as literary conventions.

is an indispensable element of communicative transactions, lending a form to the text which enables it to execute most effectively its communicative task as well as making possible its reception, supplying a socially shared "grammar of...communication and performance."²⁶⁴ These features show that genre plays a primary, catalytic role in text composition and performance. A text producer chooses and implements particular genre conventions (*mixing* genres being a compositional option) in accordance with the particular communicative task(s) he or she wishes to address by means of the text. These genre conventions, which include such things as recurrent structures, syntactic constructions, topoi, motifs, roles, plot and character configurations, supply norms for the compositional formation of the text and help regulate (without determining) the manner in which constituent parts of the text are related to one another and to the whole.²⁶⁵ Considerable freedom remains to the composer as regards implementation of conventions, fresh combinations, personal stylistic traits, and innovation within the genre tradition; indeed, genre conventions supply the parameters and raw materials for the play of personal invention.²⁶⁶

(4) *Text production, genre, and text reception:* We have emphasized

²⁶⁴ Ben-Amos, "Concepts of Genre," 40 (referring to the role of genre in folklore performance); see also Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*, 91, 131, 222 ("Gattungen'...als Konstituenten eines literarischen oder allgemein sprachlichen Kommunikationssystems" [131]), Heather Dubrow, *Genre, Critical Idiom* 42 (London & New York: Methuen, 1982), 31, Abrahams, "Genre Theory," 14-17, Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 103-104, Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 154, Berger, *Einführung*, 43, 73, 89, 115-16, 142, 167, 207, Wolfgang Richter, *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft. Entwurf einer alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie und Methodologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 38, 171, Cotterell & Turner, *Linguistics*, 99, Jürgen Landwehr, "Textsorten als 'Schlechtes Allgemeines' und der Aufstand der Lyrik," in *Textsorten und literarische Gattungen*, 235-49, esp. 239-40, Walter Seifert, "Die Funktion von Gattungen im Rezeptionsprozeß und im Literaturunterricht," in *Textsorten und literarische Gattungen*, 653-65, esp. 657-59, Horst Steinmetz, "Historisch-strukturelle Rekurrenz als Gattungs-/Textsortenkriterien," in *Textsorten und literarische Gattungen*, 68-88, esp. 69-70, 74, 79, and Theodor Lewandowski, "Textsorten," in *Linguistisches Wörterbuch*, 5th ed., UTB 1518 (Heidelberg & Wiesbaden: Quelle & Meyer, 1990), 3.1172-74.

²⁶⁵ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 164-66, 170, 232; Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 70, 104-105, 260, 285-86; Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 14.

²⁶⁶ Knierim, "Form Criticism," 458, 462; Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 286; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 164-65; Dubrow, *Genre*, 14; Abrahams, "Genre Theory," 17.

that inherent in text production as a communicative strategy (with certain pragmatic goals) is a striving towards coherence. A similar emphasis must be given to the fact that the text recipients—auditors or readers—actively seek in the process of reception to construct a coherent, intelligible text by delimiting constituent units, establishing connections between parts of the text, and relating parts to the whole on the basis of indicators of cohesion displayed by the text. Recipients both expect and work at constructing a coherent and hence intelligible text.²⁶⁷ Genre plays a role in text reception. On the one hand recipients cognitively engage socially and culturally inculcated genre knowledge in their hearing or reading of a text. On the other hand genre conventions incorporated in the text give auditors/readers signals with regard to how the text is to be heard or read, and to the degree that genre may regulate textual structures which relate constituent units to one another and to the whole it aids readers in establishing relations of cohesion.²⁶⁸ Because auditors/readers go at a text constructively, bringing along their own expectations, preconceptions, experiences, and store of knowledge, wide scope remains for multiple readings and interpretations.

Sometimes, despite strenuous efforts, recipients may be unable to establish relations of cohesion among constituent components of the text. The artificer of the text may be incompetent and simply have produced an incoherent, non-cohesive text. Alternatively (and more likely) the recipients may lack the requisite knowledge of genre and compositional conventions and/or be so removed socially, culturally, and in time from the generative, pragmatic matrix of the text that they lack the conceptual apparatus to engage and make sense of it. The point is that in either case the text is abandoned as unintelligible; communication fails;

²⁶⁷ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 74, 116-26; Ellen van Wolde, "A Text-semantic Study of the Hebrew Bible, Illustrated with Noah and Job," *JBL* 113 (1994) 19-35, esp. 30; de Beaugrande & Dressler, *Textlinguistik*, 88, 93, 99; Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 67, 90, 110; Abrahams, "Genre Theory," 16; Dubrow, *Genre*, 107; Enkvist, *Stylistics*, 112; Miller, "Genre as Social Action," 159; Berger, *Exegese*, 62; Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 77.

²⁶⁸ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 110, 130-33, 174-75, 237, 260; Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 285; de Beaugrande & Dressler, *Textlinguistik*, 93, 100; Abrahams, "Genre Theory," 14-15, 18; Hernadi, *Beyond Genre*, 2-3; Dubrow, *Genre*, 2, 106-107; Harrell and Linkugel, "Rhetorical Genre," 264-65, 268.

the “text” goes nowhere—it certainly will not be cherished, shared, and handed down!²⁶⁹

The programmatic status given to genre analysis should require no further justification. While not wholly determinative of a text’s production, performance, and reception, genre plays such a crucial role in all of these overlapping stages that any analysis of Q—redaction-critical, compositional, theological, christological, socio-historical—which ignores, subordinates, or defers questions of genre runs the risk of producing unreliable results.

Recognizing the priority of genre analysis has implications for two other issues, namely, defining the relationship (1) between tradition and redaction, and (2) between diachronic and synchronic analyses.

(1) *Redaction as (re)-performance of tradition*: Transmission of tradition occurs within the context of communicative action. No unit of tradition is “merely transmitted”, for even isolated traditions carry a hermeneutical charge. Even in oral contexts tradition is only preserved and transmitted as it is meaningfully re-performed in accordance with genre norms.²⁷⁰ The case is similar for the appropriation of traditions within texts such as Q. When texts are correctly assessed as enactments of communicative, rhetorical strategies with focused pragmatic objectives, the presence of given traditions within a text becomes attributable to the choice of the redactor who gives the tradition a fresh *actualization*. This in turn mandates that study of the selection and arrangement of traditions as regards their compositional valence within the text’s global structure and framework genre is just as important a factor as isolation and interpretation of the redactor’s fresh contributions.²⁷¹ In any case recipients will engage with the text wholis-

²⁶⁹ de Beaugrande & Dressler, *Textlinguistik*, 3-5, 88, 93; Enkvist, *Stylistics*, 112; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 119-20, 126, 257.

²⁷⁰ Abrahams, “Genre Theory,” 14-16; Lauri Honko, “Genre Theory Revisited,” in *Folk Narrative Research*, 20-25, esp. 21-22; Foley, “Words in Tradition,” 174-75; Kelber, “Jesus and Tradition,” 150. Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 196, notes that classical form criticism correctly linked oral transmission to small forms.

²⁷¹ Hardmeier, *Textlinguistik*, 78-82; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 67, 127, 235; David P. Moessner, *The Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 5-6; Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 18-20; Berger, *Exegese*, 203; idem, *Einführung*, 139-40, 165; Frankemölle, “Evangelist,” 185; Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 38, 44; Sellin, “‘Gatung’,” 312, 318-21; Theobald, “Primat,” 178; Schönlé, *Johannes, Jesus*, 23.

tically as a unified, coherent communicative initiative regardless of whatever may be its admixture of "tradition" and "redaction".

(2) *Procedural priority of synchronic over diachronic analysis*: Influenced by the *Kleineliteratur* conception of Q's formation, much Q scholarship has tended to tacitly or overtly assume that Q's present text is a surface rifted and fissured with aporias and tensions which supply entrance points for diachronic readings positing coherence only within putative subterranean strata. However, because texts represent active engagements in communicative situations, they tend towards cohesion, coherence, and specific pragmatic effects. Their formation is influenced by genre norms which assist in generating structure and coherence in service to the communicative, rhetorical strategy of a given text and to the facility of its reception. Unless one is prepared to defend the notion that the redaction of Q's present text was exempt from these determinative factors of text generation, the first step is explication of the cohesiveness and coherence of its present form in light of the genre and compositional conventions implicated in its production.

This does not at all mean the abandonment of diachronic analyses—tradition histories of constituent units or redaction histories of the text. Nor does it mean assigning "diachrony" and "synchrony" to wholly autonomous spheres (as is the case in certain ahistorical structuralist approaches). Rather, giving a certain priority to synchronic analysis enables a fruitful synthesis of synchronic and diachronic approaches that takes account of the manner in which texts are actually generated. A text's proclivity towards coherence and cohesion and the recipients' tendency to construct these properties does not at all entail that a text will possess them in anything approaching perfect, seamless proportions, that, for example, reproduction of a text has completely dissolved and absorbed a *Vorlage*, if such was used. The point is that appraisal of the coherence and cohesion achievement of the present text forms the starting point for defensible diachronic proposals. Knowledge of framework genres, text sequences produced in their implementation, ancient compositional conventions, and topoi configurations may show that apparently conflicting and discrepant tradition units are actually linked within coherent relations. "Rhetorical structure can function as an index to

compositional integrity and as a clue to intrusive elements.”²⁷² However, still apparent underneath—or protruding through—the cohesion-scheme of the present text may be residual traces of other compositional schemes and genres which betray their presence through, for example, bad, absent, or broken connections, clashing rhetorical strategies, discrepancies, indigestible shifts in word inventories and syntactic forms, or indigestibly divergent semantic values assigned to a recurring word. This is where the trained scholar is capable of a special kind of reading normally impossible for the naive reader or auditor who may be able to construct adequate coherence and cohesion in even a roughly edited text. Such phenomena observable within the present system of coherence can provide a basis for theories about the history of the text, be it tradition histories of its constituent parts or redaction histories of the text itself. Tradition-history indicators of constituent elements of the text should not, however, function without further justification as redaction-history indicators of the text as a whole.

The possibility of recovering previous stages of a text or earlier forms of its constituent elements is relative to the literary skill possessed by the redactor, the compositional mode adopted by the redactor (ranging from, for example, anonymous collection of authorities—though even that will have a focused pragmatic intent—to highly involved composition and arrangement); correspondingly, the degree to which a *Vorlage* or traditional materials are integrated into the text, and the integrative powers the predominant genre (“genres” in the case of mixed genres) is capable of exerting.²⁷³ One must be realistic about the chances of

²⁷² Robert W. Funk, “Unravelling the Jesus Tradition: Criteria and Criticism,” *Forum* 5/2 (1989) 31-61, esp. 33.

²⁷³ Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 21-23; Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 70; Raymond C. Van Leeuwen, *Context and Meaning in Proverbs 25-27*, SBLDS 96 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 31-32; Berger, *Einführung*, 18, 102; idem, *Exegese*, 29-32; Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 21, 29-33, 167; Sellin, “Gattung,” 324; Frankemölle, “Evangelist,” 170, 174; Patrick & Scult, *Rhetoric*, 17; Eep Talstra, “Deuteronomy 9 and 10: Synchronic and Diachronic Observations,” in *Synchronic or Diachronic?*, 187-210; Helmut Merklein, “Die Einheitlichkeit des ersten Korintherbriefes,” *ZNW* 75 (1984) 153-83, esp. 157-58; Theobald, “Primat,” 161-86; Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism. Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 94; Richter, *Exegese*, 177; David Greenwood, “Rhetorical Criticism as Formgeschichte: Some Methodological Considerations,” *JBL* 89 (1970) 418-26; Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 298-99; Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Parä*

recovering a redaction history; on the one hand it is possible, for example, to detect deuteronomic redaction of the Hebrew prophets or Christian additions to the pagan *Vorlage* of the *Sentences of Sextus*; on the other hand, so cohesive and integrated is Luke's travel narrative that one might not even suppose let alone demonstrate that Luke utilized a *Vorlage* were it not for the existence of the double tradition. Even in the case of obvious redaction, understanding how redaction appropriates the "traditions"—which might include a previously continuous text—remains important.

Determining Genre

Genres can be characterized as typified communicative strategies deployed in recurrent communicative situations; hence they are identifiable by an inventory of *recurrent* features, itself derived from analysis of the genre's exemplars (performances). Such analysis examines structural, grammatical, lexical, semantic, and role configurations as well as the motifs repeatedly deployed by the individual exemplars to achieve a communicative goal. It also identifies the recurrent social situations in which a certain genre may tend to appear as well as a possibly stereotyped set of exigencies to which it typically responds.²⁷⁴ As regards the text itself, recurrence appears in two intersecting dimensions: a genre's typical structure and its motif constellation (form and content):

(1) Certain motifs, or themes, may be typically configured together in an associative manner within a genre, and this configuration itself can become an genre indicator. For example, topoi such as work, marriage, family, wealth, speech, friendship, reciprocity, servant-master relations, banqueting, and hospitality are frequently serialized within an encompassing wisdom text—hence text *structure* works to *configure motifs* and relate individual motifs to the whole of the text. Berger offers the example of the

nese, WUNT 2.28 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck), 1987), 81; H. G. M. Williamson, "Synchronic and Diachronic in Isaian Perspective," in *Synchronic or Diachronic?*, 211-26, esp. 225; K. Spronk, "Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to the Book of Nahum," in *Synchronic or Diachronic?*, 159-86, esp. 185-86; Catherine Hezser, "Die Verwendung der hellenistischen Gattung Chrie im frühen Christentum und Judentum," *JSt* 27 (1996) 371-439, esp. 385-86.

²⁷⁴ See Harrell and Linkugel, "Rhetorical Genre," 267-73.

“‘Peristasenkatalog’: die Form ist die des Katalogs, die Semantik ist auf Leiden bezogen.”²⁷⁵

(2) Structure is bound up in the communicative function of the genre and for our purposes refers to (a) text organization (typical sequences, juxtapositions, hierarchies of linguistic forms), (b) syntactic, grammatical features which are recurrently deployed in service to the communicative function of the genre (for example, imperative, prohibitive voice, rhetorical questions), and (c) recurrent micro-genres or small forms (for example, admonitions, proverbs, maxims, macarisms, messenger formula). We shall see, for example, that the instructional speech genre typically opens with a programmatic admonition or maxim which invokes a conventional wisdom topic, to which is attached a more or less extensive motivational apparatus. This *structure*—admonition (imperative mode) in the programmatic threshold position followed by a body of arguments motivating obedience—helps enact a communicative, rhetorical strategy, itself capable of being placed in a recurrent social situation (for example, instruction, socialization, resocialization, perhaps tied to an institutional setting), which exploits the repeatable pragmatic effect of the text. In short, genre classification looks inward at the genre’s recurrent formal and motif configurations and outward at the communicative social situations within which texts are deployed.²⁷⁶

The process of discovery is dialectic: “Was die methodologischen Grundlagen funktionaler Textklassifikation anbetrifft, so sind Typologien sowohl auf induktivem Wege (durch die Analyse vorfindlicher Beispieltexte mit anschließender Generalisierung) als auch auf deduktivem Wege erstellt worden (durch Ableitung einzelner Textsorten aus einem Textbeschreibungsmodell).”²⁷⁷ No one-

²⁷⁵ Berger, “Form- und Gattungsgeschichte,” 431; see also idem, *Exegese*, 137-59, idem, *Einführung*, 73-74, Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 149-50, and Lentzen-Deis, “Überlegungen,” 15.

²⁷⁶ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 104-105, 147-48, 155-56, 168-73, 226; Miller, “Social Action,” 152-53, 161; Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 102-103, 262-64; Berkenkotter & Huckin, *Genre*, 17; Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 8; Knierim, “Form Criticism,” 468; Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 76, 83, 151-52; Lewandowski, “Textsorten,” 1173; Berger, “Hellenistische Gattungen,” 1044-46; idem, “Form- und Gattungsgeschichte,” 442; idem, *Einführung*, 89; Harrell and Linkugel, “Rhetorical Genre,” 267-73..

²⁷⁷ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 134; see also Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*, 135.

to-one correspondence necessarily exists between the genre and any one of its performances. "Genre" is in effect an abstraction whose contours emerge to view as it is traced across a range of flexible individual performances, in which there exists wide scope for stylistic ornamentation (or condensation) and creative variation—including mixing of genres—in accordance with the exigencies of a given socio-historical situation. In this regard striking innovations within a conventional motif configuration can be an important indicator of a tradent-group's unique ethos; for instance, the Pauline paradox of "boasting" in the "cross".²⁷⁸ It is also possible for stylistic variations to become conventional without thereby becoming genre-specific. To be able to posit a genre behind the various performances, a stable inventory of recurrent, generative features must emerge from the comparative analysis.²⁷⁹

Crucial in the genre analysis of a complex text such as Q, which consists of a large number of diverse small genres, is determination of the *framework genre*, for it will be the framework genre's task to organize the constituent small units with respect to one another and into an encompassing whole. The problem of framework genre is resolved through differentiation of the "rahmende und untergeordnete Formen."²⁸⁰ A framework genre, by virtue of its text-structuring capabilities, organizes small forms into a *hierarchy*. This hierarchy awards to certain of the text's constituent small genres predominant, governing positions of emphasis (for example, threshold positions, coordinating positions) where they orient recipients as to how the text is to be understood and form the leading edge of its pragmatic, rhetorical intent. Other constituent small genres are assigned subordinate, supportive posi-

²⁷⁸ Berger, *Exegese*, 140.

²⁷⁹ Steinmetz, "Rekurrenz," 76 ("Bündel kennzeichnender Merkmale, die die Gattung in der Geschichte jeweils prägt und ihren Gebrauch steuern"); Knierim, "Form Criticism," 447-48, 461-62; Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 8; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 141-42 ("herausragende prototypische Merkmale"), 161, 170; Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 262-63; Richter, *Exegese*, 132-39; Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*, 135-36; Sandig, "Textsortenbeschreibung," 100; Landwehr, "Textsorten," 239-40; Lentzen-Deis, "Überlegungen," 13-16; Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 76, 149-53; Berger, "Form- und Gattungsgeschichte," 431; Hezser, "Verwendung," 371, 379.

²⁸⁰ Berger, *Einführung*, 29.

tions, and hence are appropriated by the framework genre.²⁸¹ Hempfer notes the superiority of this “strukturierendes” approach, “das spezifische Relationen zwischen diesen [constituent] Elementen erstellt,” to the “taxonomisch-klassifizierenden”, which views the text as “die einfache Kumulation isolierter Elemente.”²⁸² The appropriateness of Hempfer’s judgment for Q analysis needs no comment.

Constantly to be borne in mind is the possibility of *mixed genres* appearing at the framework-genre level: more than one framework genre affecting the global configuration of the text. Such combinations themselves may serve the communicative strategy of the text producer.²⁸³ In such cases the contributing genres will likely have an affinity, for example, Egyptian demotic Instructions display features of both the classical Instruction and the monostichic Greek gnomologia (see below, chapter two). Hence in the case of Q it is unlikely that the problem of adjacent sapiential and prophetic materials can be solved by postulating that prophet book and wisdom book share the role of framework genre; on the other hand the appearance of features of the chreia collection alongside features of the Instruction, both of which are instructional genres, may not be evidence of a genre *shift* pointing to a redaction *history*. Traces of a genre *clash* may supply such evidence, though the possibility that one genre is appropriating another must be considered in such a case.²⁸⁴

Determining the Structure of Texts

As noted, genre affects but does not necessarily determine in detail the specific configuration of a given text. Certain mecha-

²⁸¹ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 59-60, 104-105, 110, 130, 175, 211-12, 260; Berger, *Exegese*, 136, 203-206; idem, “Form- und Gattungsgeschichte,” 438-41; idem, “Hellenistische Gattungen,” 1038-45; idem, *Einführung*, 73; Knierim, “Form Criticism,” 462; Dubrow, *Genre*, 116-17; Theiß, *Miracle Stories*, 11, 197; Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*, 190; Lentzen-Deis, “Überlegungen,” 14; Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 138; Seifert, “Funktion,” 657-58; Landwehr, “Textsorten,” 239-40; Cotterell & Turner, *Linguistics*, 195; Güttgemanns, *Candid Questions*, 296.

²⁸² Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*, 190.

²⁸³ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 170; Honko, “Genre Theory,” 24-25; Dubrow, *Genre*, 28-29, 117 (pastoral and epic); Kerschensteiner, “Zu Aufbau,” 190. Prof. Roger Beck has brought to my attention the fact that Petronius’ *Satyricon* resists an unequivocal genre classification.

²⁸⁴ See Sellin, “‘Gattung,’” 324.

nisms for structuring and creating cohesion within a complex text may be classified as *styles* (for example, inclusio, pronominalization, ring composition, catchword connections) applicable within any number of genre environments at the discretion of the creator of the text (though a certain stylistic form, for instance, the messenger formula, *may* be an indicator of a genre). These may be conventional styles or particular to an individual redactor.²⁸⁵

Analysis of text-structuring techniques is mandated by the fact that "there is no text or text-type...which is not structured."²⁸⁶ Text structures may give aesthetic qualities to the text, supplying "Wohlabgewogenheit und Wohlgeformtheit."²⁸⁷ Most important for our purposes, however, is that text structure, built up out of constituent textual units, creates cohesion across large swaths of text by relating diverse individual units to one another within the context of the whole. As such *they are produced by and contribute to enacting the communicative, rhetorical strategy which has generated the text.*²⁸⁸ On the one hand this implies that determination of the macro-structural configuration of the text has a role equal to delineation of its genre configuration in recovering the compositional features of the text and their significance.²⁸⁹ On the other hand the putative discovery in a text of, for example, structuring devices such as inclusio, ring composition, or chiasm is fundamentally trivial and uninteresting, and perhaps even dubious, unless it can be shown that such are important factors in carrying out the rhetorical strategy of the text. For example, van Otterlo's comments on ring composition show that in the cases he studied the device functions both *rhetorically* and *to demarcate textual units*:

²⁸⁵ Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 257-58, 265-67; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 256-58; Knierim, "Form Criticism," 452-53..

²⁸⁶ Knierim, "Form Criticism, 459, referring specifically to the Hebrew Bible.

²⁸⁷ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 258.

²⁸⁸ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 56-57, 118, 162, 215-17, 221, 252, 255, 258; see also Michael Metzeltin, "Dynamics of Cohesion in Lyrical Texts," in *Text and Discourse Connectedness*, edited by Maria-Elisabeth Conte et al., Studies in Language Companion Series 16 (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamin, 1989), 271-80, esp. 271, Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 211-12, 215.

²⁸⁹ Knierim, "Form Criticism," 459, note 93.

Das an den Anfang gestellte Thema eines bestimmten Abschnitts wird nach einer längeren oder kürzeren sich darauf beziehenden Ausführung am Schluss wiederholt, so dass der ganze Abschnitt durch Sätze gleichen Inhalts und mehr oder weniger ähnlichen Wortlauts umrahmt und so zu einem einheitlichen, sich klar vom Kontext abhebenden Gebilde geschlossen wird....Diese Struktur wendet man vorzugsweise an solchen Stellen an, wo es sich darum handelt, einen am Anfang programmatisch ausgesprochenen Satz zu beweisen.²⁹⁰

Fundamental to the creation of cohesion and structure across lengths of text is *repetition* of key words—usually representing major motifs—or configurations of key words at different points across a segment, or several segments, of text. Application of this principle enabled Lührmann to make a quantum leap forward in the understanding of Q redaction. Repetition of lexemes can demarcate a section of text and simultaneously establish rhetorical unity across it. For example, in Hesiod's *Works & Days*,

Ceux [key words] qui expriment l'idée de justice sont très nombreux dans les premières parties; par contre ἔργον (et ἐργάζεσθαι), présents partout, le sont surtout dans la partie centrale. Le groupe ὥρη, ὥριος, ὥραιος, rare au début, devient fréquent au milieu, disparaît vers la fin....La repartition des terms relatifs à la justice et au travail sur l'ensemble du poème suffit déjà à montrer qu'il y a de réelles connexions d'idées et, en même temps, un véritable mouvement des idées.²⁹¹

Such repetition demarcates segments of text—either single units or composite—by creating within them unity based on constellations of motifs distinguishable from those displayed by neighboring segments. Van Groningen's analysis of Hesiod exemplifies Heinemann's and Viehweger's statement of principle: "Die auf diese Weise miteinander verknüpften Lexeme desselben Textes bilden eine *Isotopiekette/Topikkette*, und bei umfangreicheren Texten bilden mehrere Isotopieketten das *Isotopienetz* des Gesamttextes,

²⁹⁰ W. A. A. van Otterlo, *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition* (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1944), 3; see also Ingrid Beck, *Die Ringkomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik*, Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten 25 (Hildesheim; New York: Georg Olms, 1971), and Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 82.

²⁹¹ Van Groningen, *Composition*, 296.

das wiederum als das entscheidende Erklärungspotential für die Textkohärenz gilt."²⁹² Repetition can also establish rhetorically and hermeneutically significant relationships between units of text separated from one another by intervening text, as is the case in *inclusio* and various forms of ring composition.²⁹³ For example, Teiresias' obscure oracle in lines 413-60 of *Oedipus Tyrannus* and its recapitulative realization toward the end of the drama set up a loose ring structure mediating a creative dramatic tension between *riddling obscurity* and *full revelation*.²⁹⁴ Repetition of the key word "son" (*ben*) in Ruth 1:1-6 and 4:13-17 mediates a crisis/resolution relationship: "The crisis for Naomi was the loss of her two sons. The crisis is resolved when the final episode reports that a son is born."²⁹⁵ Grossberg notes that in Psalm 29 the opening admonition to give "to Yahweh *glory* and *might*" in the divine pantheon recurs at the end as God "conferring *might* on His people, here on earth." Thus the *inclusio* enacts a movement from heaven to earth, from transcendence to immanence, and a *reversal* of bestower and recipient.²⁹⁶ Rebera states, "Lexical cohesion, especially reiteration, can span large stretches of text with undiminished force for establishing relevance and integrating components of the text."²⁹⁷

Repeated key words or configurations of key words can assume relations of direct repetition, pronominalization, various forms of synonymous expression (words from the same semantic field), paraphrase or circumlocution, or recur as antonyms, the latter

²⁹² Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 38; see also Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 96-98.

²⁹³ H. van Dyke Parunak, "Oral Typesetting: Some Uses of Biblical Structure," *Bib* 62 (1981) 153-68, esp. 168; James Muilenberg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *JBL* 88 (1969) 1-18, esp. 17; idem, "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," in *Congress Volume*, VT Suppl. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1953), 97-111, esp. 99; Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 83; Otterlo, *Untersuchungen*, 3 (see citation above).

²⁹⁴ Havelock, "Oral Composition," 189-90.

²⁹⁵ Basil Rebera, "Lexical Cohesion in Ruth: A Sample," in *Perspectives on Language and Text*, edited by Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 123-45, esp. 147-48.

²⁹⁶ Daniel Grossberg, "The Disparate Elements of the *Inclusio* in the Psalms," *HAR* 6 (1982) 97-104, esp. 100-101. See also Parunak, "Oral Typesetting," 158, and Isaac M. Kikawada, "Some Proposals for the Definition of Rhetorical Criticism," *Semiotics* 5 (1977) 67-91, esp. 75-83.

²⁹⁷ Rebera, "Lexical Cohesion," 143. See also Enkvist, *Linguistic Stylistics*, 122 and de Beaugrande & Dressler, *Textlinguistik*, 63.

setting up relations of opposition or reversal.²⁹⁸ Repetition can also move past the level of single words to repetition of sentences, grammatical structures such as questions/answers, and small forms. As the examples cited above show, repetition is hermeneutically significant, even if it exists merely at the level of catchwords connecting juxtaposed units, since such juxtaposition may itself set up associative relations between conjoined units. By setting up a network of relations between words, repetition limits the semantic polyvalency the same words might have had in isolation. "Cohesion occurs where some element in the discourse is dependent for its interpretation upon some other element which occurs before or after it. Where one such element is effectively decoded by recourse to another, a relation of cohesion is set up."²⁹⁹ Readers or auditors, as active constructors of text coherence, with more or less facility (depending upon experience and skill) establish connections of cohesion within the text indicated by repetition and draw the relevant interpretive inferences.³⁰⁰

Cohesion established by text structure is most obvious at the level of a *linear sequence* of textual units, worked out with such devices as pronominalization, catchword, or bare juxtaposition, all of which can establish associative, hermeneutically charged relationships between discrete units.³⁰¹ Working in concert with such linear sequencing, text-demarcating devices such as inclusio, ring composition, frameworking, and chiasm have the capacity to establish elaborative connections between non-contiguous units.³⁰²

²⁹⁸ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 39; Rebera, "Lexical Cohesion," 126-27; Enkvist, *Linguistic Stylistics*, 117-18; de Beaugrande & Dressler, *Textlinguistik*, 57-63; Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 79.

²⁹⁹ Rebera, "Lexical Cohesion," 123-24; see also van Wolde, "Text-semantic Study," 28-29, and Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 39.

³⁰⁰ van Wolde, "Text-semantic Study," 25-26, 30-31; Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 213.

³⁰¹ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 227; van Leeuwen, *Context and Meaning*, 37; John Dominic Crossan, *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983), 120; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Sword of His Mouth*, SBL Semeia Suppl. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 21.

³⁰² For discussions of the compositional, elaborative arrangements enabled by complex ring composition see Cotterell & Turner, *Linguistics*, 295, John Breck, "Biblical Chiasmus: Exploring Structure for Meaning," *BTB* 17 (1978) 70-74,

However, one must supply convincing demonstrations that such are actually present in a text, particularly given the mind's powers of abstraction and organization.³⁰³ The proliferation of, for example, claims of chiasmus discoveries has quite understandably induced not a few scholars to seek refuge in a reflexively skeptical attitude toward any such proposal. James Kugel notes that the "chiasmaniacs" frequently rely upon exegetical abstractions, excerption, arbitrary labeling, while (here attacking the ahistorical structuralist approach) paying little attention to either the form-critical and tradition-history divisions visible within clearly composite texts or to issues relating to "ancient literary competence."³⁰⁴

Such uncontrolled proliferation of often conflicting proposals calls for a set of stiff criteria for verification which, among other things, will serve to historicize the compositional analysis. Text-structure proposals of any sort should be taken seriously if they meet at least the first four and ideally all seven of the following conditions:

(1) Appeal is made to lexical and formal patterns of recurrence embedded in the text rather than to exegetical abstractions and labels.³⁰⁵

H. van Dyke Parunak, "Some Axioms for Literary Architecture," *Semiotics* 8 (1982) 1-16, Angelico-Salvatore Di Marco, "Rhetoric and Hermeneutic—On a Rhetorical Pattern: Chiasmus and Circularity," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 479-91, B. M. F. van Iersel, "Concentric Structures in Mark 2,1-3, 6 and 3,7-4, 1: A Case Study," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, 521-30, S. Bar-Efrat, "Some Observations on the Analysis of Structure in Biblical Narrative," *VT* 30 (1980) 154-73, David J. Clark, "Criteria for Identifying Chiasm," *LB* 35 (1975) 63-72, and John W. Welch, ed., *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981).

³⁰³ The force of the objection which appeals to the notion that the human mind inherently tends to impose patterns on received texts is weakened considerably by the fact that the same cognitive tendency must then be attributed to the *production* of the text, the supreme act of creating order out of chaos.

³⁰⁴ James Kugel, "On the Bible and Literary Criticism," *Prooftexts* 1 (1981) 217-36, esp. 232-33; idem, "James Kugel Responds," *Prooftexts* 2 (1982) 328-32; see also Adele Berlin's response: "On the Bible as Literature," *Prooftexts* 2 (1982) 323-27.

³⁰⁵ van Wolde, "Text-semantic Study," 24-25, notes that some chiastic proposals for the structure of the Flood story in Genesis do not cohere with the patterns of lexical recurrence uncovered by a text-semantic analysis. See Ruth Scoralick, *Einzel spruch und Sammlung. Komposition im Buch der Sprichwörter Kapitel 10-15*, BZAW 232 (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1995), 5, 98, 159, 240, and Rebera, "Lexical Recurrence" (on Ruth), for exemplary application of the principle of recovering text structures by paying attention to lexical recurrence.

(2) Proposed text configurations are visibly built up out of the text's smaller constituent units. Naturally this means that *demarcation of the smaller constituent units on form-critical grounds* has already occurred.³⁰⁶

(3) The configuration helps execute a specific rhetorical strategy.³⁰⁷

(4) A case can be made for its replication elsewhere in the same text (if extensive enough to allow this kind of control): "...consistency of technique...across the corpus...."³⁰⁸

(5) The proposed arrangement dovetails to some degree with textual configurations directly attributable to the influence of ancient genre conventions operative in the text, or, alternatively, it can be shown that genre conventions in this case are being mediated by the proposed textual structure.

(6) The compositional arrangement in some manner performs a "plot", myth, or story that has conventional or even archetypal status in the text's socio-historical setting. A traditional dramatic sequence, an archetypal myth, or a ritual structure can supply an integrating dynamic for a collection of traditions which might otherwise appear disconnected and incoherent.³⁰⁹ "In literary criticism myth means ultimately *mythos*, a structural organizing principle of literary form."³¹⁰

(7) Similar arrangements are attested in other ancient texts

³⁰⁶ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 254; Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 211-12.

³⁰⁷ See Michael Kolarcik, *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1-6: A Study of Literary Structure and Interpretation*, AnBib 127 (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), 1-2, Di Marco, "Rhetoric and Hermeneutic," 488, and van Leeuwen, *Context and Meaning*, 37.

³⁰⁸ Scott, "Blowing in the Wind," 189.

³⁰⁹ Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 99, 105, 215, noting that "myths" can "explain the structural principles behind familiar literary facts" (205). See also Harrell and Linkugel, "Rhetorical Genre," 265, 270. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, shows that a Moses typology and "a coherent drama of a New Exodus" (260) are integratively constitutive of the arrangement of the diverse units making up Luke's travel narrative (31-32, 60, 260, 290-92). See also Reinhold Merkelbach, *Die Hirten des Dionysos* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1988) (Dionysiac ritual and myth as structurally underlying the action of *Daphnis & Chloe*), Mieke Bal, "Experiencing Murder: Ritualistic Interpretation of Ancient Texts," in *Victor Turner and the Construction of Cultural Criticism: Between Literature and Anthropology*, edited by Kathleen M. Ashley (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 3-20, esp. 6, and Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 215.

³¹⁰ Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 341.

where they display one or more of a similar rhetorical strategy, plot, and constellation of motifs.

Since both text producer and text recipient are embedded in concrete social relations, and since text production as linguistic, communicative activity is also social activity, the text will on the one hand reflect social relations and on the other be a catalyzing agent advocating a set of social interests. The text can neither be etherealized into a detached entity to be plotted within theological or literary histories, nor can its social location be narrowly defined (in the case of Q) to the "Q community". Rather, the text will reflect the far from disinterested entanglement of its tradent group in the social relations and conflicts of its encompassing socio-historical situation: "Texte haben stets 'eine konkrete gesellschaftliche Existenz' (Hartung u.a. 1974, 19). Sie spiegelt sich nicht nur in den Textinhalten wider, sondern auch in den Strategien der Partner, bei der Textorganisation und in der Textformulierung."³¹¹ The capacity of a text to mesh with the dynamics of a given socio-historical situation represents another dimension of its coherence and also justifies application of analytical models drawn from other disciplines (in particular, the social sciences).

Given the current climate of Q studies, a word needs to be said about how this study relates to the issue of the Two Document Hypothesis. Genre-critical analysis of Q, an approach that also probes for the presence of compositional conventions, in a dialectical manner both *assumes and tests the Q hypothesis*. Subjecting "Q" to the rigors of comparative genre research supplies a tough (and previously under-utilized) external control on the 2DH. It is one thing to contest or defend the Q hypothesis in the arena of redaction and source-critical analyses oriented to internal investigation of synoptic texts; it is quite another to expose it to the cold winds of rigorous genre analysis in the context of

³¹¹ Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 17, citing W. Hartung, *Sprachliche Kommunikation und Gesellschaft* (Berlin, 1974). See also idem, 54, 64-65, Miller, "Genre as Social Action," *passim*, Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 24, idem, *Exegese*, 204, idem, *Einführung*, 167, 207, Theißen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. by Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 21, Güttgemanns, *Candid Questions*, 121, and Horsley, "Social Conflict," 37-53.

comparative research in ancient literature, an analysis that until recently has been obstructed by *Kleinliteratur* preconceptions.

We turn our attention now to the main business of comparative genre analysis in ancient texts with a view to acquiring heuristic models for analysis of Q composition.

CHAPTER TWO

INSTRUCTIONAL SPEECH COMPOSITIONS IN ANCIENT WISDOM LITERATURE

In this chapter we shall examine the instructional speech in its various permutations across a range of ancient wisdom texts with a view to defining its characteristic contours. We shall then use the results heuristically in chapter three to clarify the composition and genre of Q's sayings clusters.

Choosing comparative texts exclusively from ancient Mediterranean wisdom literature appears to beg the question of Q's genre. However, there are good reasons for preferring wisdom literature over an alternative corpus, the main counter-claimant in this case being prophetic literature. It will be recalled that while we found much to admire in Sato's trail-blazing approach to the question of Q's framework genre, his case for identifying the prophet book as that genre seemed unable to account satisfactorily for important features of Q's profile, in particular the pervasiveness of wisdom forms. To be sure, small wisdom genres are to be found in the prophetic books, such as chains of questions, observations from nature and agriculture, numerical sequences, parables, and admonitions.¹ This may tempt one to draw an analogy with Q, where indeed sapiential and prophetic genres—such as announcements of judgment—appear together. However, in striking contrast to Q, admonitions (*Mahnworte*) are relatively rare in the pre-exilic prophet books (virtually absent in Hosea; rare in Amos and Micah; distributed sparsely in first Isaiah and Jeremiah). When they do appear admonitions serve to emphasize Israel's disobedience (*Schuldaufweis*), which has evoked the dominating prophetic message of judgment, and thus as re-

¹ Hans Walter Wolff, *Amos the Prophet. The Man and His Background*, trans. by Foster R. McCurley, edited by John Riches (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), 8-9, 13-14, 32, 42-43; William J. Whedbee, *Isaiah and Wisdom* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971). For criticism of Wolff's claims see J. L. Crenshaw, "The Influence of the Wise upon Amos. The 'Doxologies of Amos' and Job 5:9-16; 9:5-10," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 42-52.

gards rhetorical function stand in a supportive relationship—acting as *Begründung*—to the latter. Prophetic admonitions are articulated before the horizon of a future determined by Yahweh's inevitable acts of judgment and salvation.² Wisdom admonitions, in contrast, are predicated upon an open future ostensibly contingent upon a person's choice whether or not to heed. This points up the crucial importance of determining framework genre, which functions to establish hierarchies among small genres of a text. In the case of the prophet books, the small wisdom forms are appropriated by and subordinated to the dominant genre of announcement of judgment: "Damit zeigen die auf Jeremia zurückzuführenden Mahnworte, daß sie der definitiven Unheilsansage des Propheten stets untergeordnet sind."³ This is decidedly not the case in Q, where the exact opposite obtains. In the same vein, Q's speeches lack the close attribution to the word of Yahweh characteristic of prophetic speeches.⁴

Though analysis involves constant dialectical movement back and forth between Q and the corpus of literature selected for comparison, having a chapter devoted to comparative genre research serve as frontispiece highlights the privileged status genre analysis should enjoy in exploration of Q's redaction history. This approach, which posits a close relationship between genre criticism and redaction criticism, represents a crucial shift with respect to Kloppenborg's methodology. Kloppenborg asserts:

One must first determine the principles of composition of Q and the portions of it which were formative from a literary-critical perspective. Only then is it possible to compare Q with antique genres and determine the extent to which Q shares or fails to share the characteristics and tendencies of those genres. It must be shown on redactional grounds that certain elements (e.g., apocalyptic Son of Man sayings) belong to a secondary compositional level and that compositionally and literarily the wisdom sayings, and the wisdom-gospel format, are foundational and formative for the document.

² Georg Warmuth, *Das Mahnwort. Seine Bedeutung für die Verkündigung der vorexilischen Propheten Amos, Hosea, Micha, Jesaja, und Jeremia*, BEvT 1 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang; Bern: Herbert Lang, 1976), 25, 35, 46-48, 55-60, 82-83, 94, 168-69; Wolff, *Amos*, 45.

³ Warmuth, *Mahnwort*, 136; see also pages 17, 35-36, 82-83, 147, Wolff, *Amos*, 85-86, Whedbee, *Isaiah & Wisdom*, 75, 147-52, and Gene M. Tucker, "Prophetic Speech," *Int* 32 (1978) 31-45, esp. 35-36.

⁴ Tucker, "Prophetic Speech," 34-35, 43-45; Wolff, *Amos*, 85-86.

Such a conclusion can be obtained in the first place only from an analysis of Q itself, not by comparative analysis.⁵

Kloppenborg issues this programmatic statement of methodology in response to Koester's somewhat circular procedure of using *Gos. Thom.* "as a criterion for deciding what was formative in Q," which is based on "the presupposition that *Gos. Thom.* is the best representative of the genre of which Q is also a member."⁶ Kloppenborg's critique of Koester on this point is apposite but his methodological solution—making genre criticism subordinate and posterior to redaction-critical analysis—is problematic. We argued in chapter one that redaction as text-production occurs under the rubric of a set of genre conventions. Redaction-critical analysis proceeding independently of genre analysis, and hence without consideration of the coherence-giving powers of the operative genre(s), runs the risk of making inappropriate assessments of coherence or incoherence and thus misconstruing the redaction history of the text. Harrell and Linkugel point out that genre criticism "strives to generate theoretical constructs that assist the critic in making his assessment of specific instances of discourse."⁷ By making genre considerations subordinate to redaction-critical operations carried out on other grounds Kloppenborg fails to give the former the programmatic status requisite for accurate assessment of the production of the text. The fragility of Kloppenborg's criteria for distinguishing redactional strata—changes in projected audience and mood; shifts from paraenesis to prophetic judgment and from instructions to chreiae—is shown by the fact that comparable alternations appear in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, yet a solid consensus exists among Hesiod scholars that though the *Lehrgedicht* incorporates diverse traditional materials, it came into existence more or less in its present form (see below).⁸

The problem with Koester's approach is not that it gives prio-

⁵ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 38-39.

⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 38. See Helmut Koester, "GNOMAI DIAPHORAI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," *Trajectories*, 114-57, and idem, "One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels," *Trajectories*, 158-204.

⁷ Harrell & Linkugel, "Rhetorical Genre," 275; see also Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 246.

⁸ Kloppenborg discusses his redaction-history indicators in *Formation*, 167-70, 238-42.

urity to comparative genre analysis; this is its virtue. Problematic rather is its limiting of the comparative enterprise to, and generalizing from, a single specimen, in this case, the *Gos. Thom.*, and awarding just one socio-historical performance of a genre normative status against which alleged developments and deviations in other performances might be measured. This is what Hempfer and Sellin call the "Archetypus" fallacy, which identifies the "pure form" of a genre (only a theoretical construct) with one of its performances, and then draws historical inferences with regard to priority.⁹ The response should be a more ambitious comparative venture into a wide selection of ancient wisdom texts to establish the range of compositional possibilities open to the redactor of Q, and then to compare the redactor's performance of those genre conventions with other performances.

Defining Small Wisdom Forms

Quite a bit of work has been done on small wisdom forms. More recently scholars have given more attention to the longer instructional speeches built up from the smaller forms.¹⁰ Our interest is in the composite wisdom speech; however, some terminological clarifications with regard to the small forms are necessary.

The *proverb* is a succinct statement in general circulation which makes an observation about a typicality in the world of experience and thereby delivers an insight about some aspect of reality and human experience. It is rooted in collective, traditional wisdom, and its claim to present a broadly applicable observation about the nature of reality thus serves an integrative function in the disparate, chaotic world of experience and lends to it its ability to command assent. Because of its capacity to stimulate reflection on the nature of reality and illuminate contemplated actions, the proverb can be integrated into didactic contexts.¹¹ Embedded within such settings, the proverb can take on

⁹ Hempfer, *Gattungstheorie*, 133, and Sellin, "'Gattung,'" 317, 324. See also Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 286-87, and Theißen, *Miracle Stories*, 23-24.

¹⁰ Roland E. Murphy, "Form Criticism and Wisdom Literature," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 475-83, esp. 438; Christa Kayatz, *Studien zu Proverbien 1-9: Eine form- und motiwgeschichtliche Untersuchung unter Einbeziehung ägyptischen Vergleichsmaterials*, WMANT 22 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1966).

¹¹ Murphy, "Form Criticism," 479; William A. Beardslee, "Uses of the

admonitory connotations and hence fill the role of an admonition.¹² Correspondingly, a proverb can be appended to an admonition or prohibition as a motive or rationale (*Begründung*).¹³

The *maxim* is so similar to the proverb that there is not much use, for the purposes of this study, in distinguishing them.¹⁴ Wilson differentiates them on the grounds that a proverb originates in folk culture, while a maxim is linked to a specific sage.¹⁵ Since Q attributes its wisdom sayings to Jesus, we shall prefer the term *maxim*.

Another term for a small wisdom form which will prove useful is *aphorism*. Formally the aphorism bears a close resemblance to the maxim (or proverb) but by clever altering of conventional proverbs or a fresh coinage aphoristic wisdom calls in question the traditional order supported by conventional wisdom while simultaneously projecting a vision of an alternative order.¹⁶ Perdue emphasizes the subversive aspect of an aphorism, namely, its capacity to "shock, disorient, and throw into disarray its hearers."¹⁷ The nature of the aphorism as being the expression of the personal authority of a sage differentiates it from the proverb, which is a piece of collective, traditional wisdom, though a sage may make ironic, subversive, and hence aphoristic use of traditional proverbs.¹⁸

Proverb in the Synoptic Gospels," *Int* 24 (1970) 61-73, esp. 63, 65; Max Küchler, *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen. Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens*, OBO 26 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 161; Thomas, *Phokylides*, 27; Leo G. Perdue, "The Wisdom Sayings of Jesus," *Forum* 2/3 (1986) 3-35, esp. 7; H. Gese, "Weisheitsdichtung," *RGK*, 3rd ed. (1962), 6.1577-81, esp. 1577; Crossan, *In Fragments*, 20, 25; Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs*, 33, 42.

¹² Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 25; Berger, *Einführung*, 31.

¹³ A. de Buck, "La composition littéraire des enseignements d'Amenemhat," *Mus* 59 (1946) 183-200, esp. 192, noting the use of proverbs as motives to imperatives in the Egyptian Instructions.

¹⁴ Gese, "Weisheitsdichtung," 1577.

¹⁵ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 12. Charles E. Carlston, "Proverbs, Maxims, and the Historical Jesus," *JBL* 99 (1980) 87-105, suggests that proverbs are maxims which have gained common currency (88).

¹⁶ Beardslee, "Uses," 69-72; Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs*, 14, 47, 79-81.

¹⁷ Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 28-29; see also Crossan, *In Fragments*, 6-7, on the tendency of aphorisms to express paradoxes or to modify conventional wisdom in a manner calculated to surprise.

¹⁸ Crossan, *In Fragments*, 20-26; Jess Nierenberg, "Proverbs in Graffiti: Taunting Traditional Wisdom," *Maledicta* 7 (1983) 41-58.

A third wisdom micro-genre important for Q-analysis is the *admonition*. In contrast to the invitation to reflection extended by the proverb, maxim, and aphorism, the admonition issues a demand for obedience and thus frequently appears accompanied by a motive clause(s), which might take the form of rationale and consequence clauses.¹⁹ The admonition uses direct address but can appear in a variety of forms other than the simple imperative, for example, as a rhetorical question, as in, "How long, O simple ones, will you love being simple?" (Prov 1:22a), as a conditional clause, as in, "My son, if you receive my words..." (Prov 2:1), or as a prohibition.²⁰ The wisdom admonition possesses gnomic qualities; often only the imperative voice of the admonition distinguishes it from the indicative maxim.²¹ A maxim is convertible to an admonition, and vice versa. The normative force of a maxim allows it to substitute for an admonition within a wisdom speech composition.

Though other wisdom micro-genres occur in Q,²² the three forms *maxim*, *aphorism*, and *admonition* are most crucial to the analysis undertaken here. Quite frequently we shall employ the general term *gnomic saying* where a precise description of the form is not important.²³

A gnomic saying by its very nature requires a context, and so it is natural for it to appear in an extended instructional speech which gives it pragmatic force for a specific situation. Such a saying packages an aspect of experience so tightly that it can loosen itself from specific situations and roam about freely from context to context. This can be described as a gnome's *hermeneutical openness*. But in order to be *actualized* the gnome must be *performed* within a specific context which exploits its hermeneutical riches for precisely that situation.²⁴ Survival of gnomic say-

¹⁹ Murphy, "Form Criticism," 480; Richter, *Exegese*, 144.

²⁰ John G. Gammie, "Paraenetic Literature: Toward the Morphology of a Secondary Genre," in *Paraenesis: Act and Form = Semeia* 50, eds. Leo G. Perdue and John G. Gammie (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 41-77, esp. 60; Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 18.

²¹ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 24-25; Berger, *Einführung*, 31; Beardslee, "Uses," 66.

²² For example, the blessing, or macarism; see Murphy, "Form Criticism," 480, and Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 16-17.

²³ See Crossan, *In Fragments*, 20.

²⁴ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 17; Berger, *Exegese*, 36; Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*,

ings depends upon their actualization in fitting situations. Hence the creation of short literary contexts which embed sayings in prominent positions and draw out their expressive, pragmatic power is at the heart of the wisdom enterprise.²⁵ However germane they may be to wisdom, gnomic sayings are not bound to any particular genre but are exploited in a variety of literary and rhetorical contexts.²⁶

Egyptian Instructional Compositions

Specimens of the Instruction genre from Egypt are attested over a period of twenty-five hundred years, beginning from the third millennium B. C. Despite the long time period during which they were being produced, the form-critical characteristics of the instructional speeches show remarkable stability.²⁷ The small form fundamental to the instructional speech is: admonition (often bipartite) + motive sentence (*Begründung*), with the motive frequently supplied by a gnomic saying.²⁸ Both the admonition and motive may be doubled, tripled, or even quadrupled.²⁹ The basic unit, admonition + motive, typically stands programmatically at the beginning of a shorter or longer speech, within which the lead-

10, 25 ("rhetorical environment"); Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 167; Beardslee, "Uses," 63-66; Alan P. Winton, *The Proverbs of Jesus: Issues of History and Rhetoric*, JSNTSuppl 35 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 66. Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 64, draws attention to the maxim in Luke 12:2, which appears in two additional contexts (Mark 4:22; Matthew 10:26), all of which exploit the hermeneutical potential of the saying in a different way.

²⁵ Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 7. See also Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 167, and Piper, *Wisdom*, 7.

²⁶ Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 62, 156.

²⁷ Kenneth A. Kitchen, "The Basic Literary Forms and Formulations of Ancient Instructional Writings in Egypt and Western Asia," in *Studien zu Alt-ägyptischen Lebenslehren*, eds. Erik Horning and Othmar Keel, OBO 28 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 81; Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 81; K. F. D. Röhmdel, *Die Weisheitslehre im Alten Orient. Elemente einer Formgeschichte*, Biblische Notizen, Beihefte 4 (München: Manfred Görg, 1989), 84 ("homogenous Tradition"); Ronald J. Williams, "Scribal Training in Ancient Egypt," *JAOS* 92 (1972) 214-21, esp. 215. A shift appears with the advent of the influence of Hellenism in Egypt.

²⁸ William McKane, *Proverbs: A New Approach*, The Old Testament Library (London: SCM, 1970), 3; de Buck, "Composition," 192.

²⁹ Kayatz, *Studien*, 33.

ing topic it articulates is elaborated and “konkretisiert” in a series of rhetorical maneuvers which can make use of a variety of small genres.³⁰ The speech is not infrequently brought to a definitive conclusion using either a concluding admonition or a maxim which epitomizes the programmatic theme and at times forms an *inclusio* with the opening admonition. Kayatz states, “Viele solcher Einheiten weisen deutlich einen zusammenfassenden Schluß auf, der sich auf alle vorausgegangenen Mahnworte bezieht und sie abschließend unter einen gemeinsamen Blickpunkt rückt und sie so ausdrücklich zu einer Einheit zusammenschließt,” though the Egyptian speech form shows quite a bit of variety with regard to tightness or looseness of composition.³¹ Additional imperatives and motive clauses can appear in the body of the speech, all supportive of the opening admonition.³² Frequently gnomic sayings appear in a supportive role as well, serving both to illustrate the programmatic theme in a memorable way and to ground its claim in common wisdom.³³ Similes, comparisons, and examples appear with regularity, always serving the persuasive goal of the instruction.³⁴ Constituent units are linked together with various devices such as anaphoric pronouns, catchwords, and *inclusio*.³⁵ Such speeches are serialized and form “the major constitutive elements within the framework genre ‘Instruction.’”³⁶ The Instruction framework genre, through a prologue and epilogue, links the speeches to an authoritative speaker, the sage.³⁷

³⁰ Kayatz, *Studien*, 35; Kitchen, “Basic Literary Forms,” 256.

³¹ Kayatz, *Studien*, 37, also 29; see also Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 84, and Kitchen, “Basic Literary Forms,” 243.

³² Kayatz, *Studien*, 36.

³³ Römheld, *Formgeschichte*, 11; Miriam Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature in the International Context. A Study of Demotic Instructions*, OBO 52 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 6-7; see also Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 83.

³⁴ Kayatz, *Studien*, 59. Non-wisdom genres such as hymns, narrative descriptions, and autobiographical elements may also appear in an instructional speech (Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 81, 84). McKane, *Proverbs*, 3, correctly emphasizes the admonition’s domination of the instructional speech, but seriously underestimates the capacity of the instructional framework genre to incorporate other genres.

³⁵ Jutta Krispenz, *Spruchkompositionen im Buch Proverbia*, Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII 346 (Bern; New York; Paris: Peter Lang, 1989), 146-47; Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 85.

³⁶ Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 7.

³⁷ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 87; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 25; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 274; Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 185.

The compositional arrangement of *Ptahotep* 6, 7-10 is as follows:³⁸

<i>Opening Admonition:</i>	Do not inspire terror in men,
<i>Motive Clause:</i>	for God is also repelled.
<i>Example:</i>	A man expects to live by it [inspiring terror] and (consequently) is lacking bread to eat.
<i>Example:</i>	A man expects to become wealthy <through it> and says, "I will acquire for myself what I perceive"; a man says, "I will plunder someone else," and he ends by giving it to someone whom he does not know.
<i>Gnomic Saying:</i>	No terror of man has ever been effective; it is (only) the ordinance of God which is effective.
<i>Concluding Admonition:</i>	Plan to live in peace
<i>Promise, Result Clause:</i>	and what men give will come of its own accord.

The motive clause implicitly invokes a divine sanction. The two examples argue that terror will achieve the opposite of what it intends. The concluding admonition is a positive reversal of the opening prohibition and a positive restatement of the negative lessons of the examples. Thus the speech terminates by giving a positive counterpart to the dissuasions which characterize the preceding elements.

Most speeches in *Ptahotep* begin with "If you..." + a certain situation or moral issue + a thematic admonition (sometimes single, but also in groups of two or three) + motive clause(s) (often with a maxim-like nature) + explanatory indicative statements, sometimes gnomic, which provide additional motives for obedience + a final, maxim-like conclusion (sometimes absent).³⁹ *Ptahotep* 5, 9-10 illustrates a simple version of this pattern, lacking, however, the situational opening:⁴⁰

<i>Opening Admonition:</i>	Do not be arrogant because of your knowledge, but confer with the ignorant man as with the learned.
<i>Motive (gnomic):</i>	For the limit of skill has not been attained,

³⁸ Translations are from W. K. Simpson, *The Literature of Ancient Egypt*, new ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973) unless otherwise indicated.

³⁹ Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 2, gives a similar analysis.

⁴⁰ Cited by Kayatz, *Studien*, 33, as an exemplar of the basic pattern.

and there is no craftsman who has (fully) acquired his mastery.

Concluding Maxim:

Good speech is more hidden than malachite, yet it is found in the possession of women slaves at the millstones.

The opening admonition itself has gnomic qualities; admonitions are after all wisdom expressed as a demand. The motive clause also is gnomic, and the closing maxim's reference to "women slaves" is reminiscent of the "ignorant man" of the opening admonition and suggests that conferral with those perceived as ignorant might be unexpectedly rewarding.

Amenemope is characterized by its practice of adding concluding maxims to the basic pattern of opening admonition(s) + motive clause(s) + closing admonition(s).⁴¹ An example is chapter 16:

Opening Admonitions:

Do not displace the surveyor's marker on the boundaries of the arable land,
Nor alter the position of the measuring line;
Do not be greedy for a plot of land,
Nor overturn the boundaries of the widow.

Motive, example, divine sanction:

As for the road in the field worn down by time,
He who takes it violently for fields,
If he traps by deceptive attestations,
Will be lassoed by the might of the Moon....
His storerooms are toppled over,
His property taken from his children,
And to someone else his possessions given.

Reiterative Admonition:

Take care not to topple over the boundary marks of the arable land....

Motive:

Man propitiates God by the might of the lord,
When he sets straight the boundaries of the arable land.

Closing Admonitions:

Desire, then, to make yourself prosper,
And take care for the lord of all;
Do not trample on the furrow of someone else

⁴¹ Kayatz, *Studien*, 38-40.

Their good order will be profitable for
 you.
 So plough the fields, and you will find
 whatever you need,
 And receive the bread from your own
 threshing floor.
Concluding Maxims: Better is the bushel which God gives you
 Than five thousand deceitfully gotten....
 Better, then, is poverty in the hand of
 God
 Than riches in the storehouse;
 Better is bread when the mind is at ease
 Than riches with anxiety.

The opening admonitions are programmatic. The first motive section incorporates a divine sanction depicting the horrible fate of the greedy, fraudulent man. The closing admonitions (1) paraphrase the opening admonitions, (2) give a positive alternative to the prohibition against gaining land by fraud (get bread by working your own field), and (3) contain, at least implicitly, a promise of provision.⁴² This final series of admonitions is cumulative with respect to the preceding speech.⁴³ The concluding maxims support the programmatic ethic by promising God's provision and peace even in poverty.

The following speech is taken from the *Instruction of Any* (9,6-10):⁴⁴

<i>Opening Admonitions:</i>	Do not talk back to an angry superior Let him have his way Speak sweetly when he speaks sourly
<i>Motive:</i>	It's the remedy that calms the heart.
<i>Gnomic Saying:</i>	Fighting answers carry sticks, And your strength collapses.
	
<i>Admonition:</i>	Do not vex your heart.
<i>Motive:</i>	He will return to praise you soon,

⁴² Not all of *Amenemope's* speeches, however, close with a positive admonition; many just paraphrase the opening prohibition.

⁴³ Kayatz, *Studien*, 59, "...ein letzter Imperativ als Konsequenz aus allen vorangegangenen Mahnungen und Begründungen."

⁴⁴ Translation by Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, vol. 2, *The New Kingdom* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976), 135-46, esp. 143.

	When his hour of rage has passed.
<i>Gnomic Saying:</i>	If your words please the heart
	The heart tends to accept them.
<i>Closing Admonitions:</i>	Choose silence for yourself,
	Submit to what he does.

The inclusio formed by the opening and closing admonitions is obvious, though the closing renders the opening in different words. Not all the speeches in *Any* replicate the tightness of this composition, but neither is this speech exceptional. Most of the others follow the same pattern of an opening admonition followed by a series of motives, reasons, gnomes, examples, and reiterative admonitions.

In the later Demotic *Instruction of Ankhsheshonq*, the conventional instructional speech featuring the binary sentence virtually disappears in favor of a less ordered monostichic composition. Lichtheim lists the ordering techniques as being pairing of monostichs, chains of catchword-linked anaphoric sentences, and link-words engineering transitions between topics.⁴⁵ Maxims still appear in support of admonitions: "Do not kill a snake and then leave its tail. Do not hurl a lance if you cannot control its aim. He who sends spittle to the sky, upon his face it falls" (11, 8-10), though they also appear randomly.⁴⁶ Another Demotic Instruction, *Papyrus Insinger*, likewise shows marked preference for monostichs linked in anaphoric chains by means of key words and pronouns. However, unlike *Ankhsheshonq*, the author of *Insinger* attempts to give some structure to groups of monostichs in ways which recall the traditional Instructions, gathering sayings into topical groups under a programmatic opening imperative followed by indicative statements. Occasionally a statement is followed by a motive clause in a manner likewise reminiscent of the older instructional sentences. Within these clusters "often there is...a real progression of thought, a true development of a theme that starts from particular cases and proceeds to clinching generalizations and emphatic climaxes."⁴⁷ Wilson offers the following compositional analysis of 26.18-27.1:

⁴⁵ Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 10-11, 63-65; idem, "Observations on Papyrus Insinger," in *Studien zu Altägyptischen Lebenslehren*, 283-305, esp. 285, 288; see also Kayatz, *Studien*, 23, and Krispenz, *Spruchkompositionen*, 147-48.

⁴⁶ Cited by Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 35-36.

⁴⁷ Lichtheim, "Observations," 289-90; see also idem, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*,

- 26.18. Do not alter your word when spending, do not cheat at the time of sealing (a contract).
- 26.19. A wise man who is trusted, his pledge is in one's hand.
- 26.20. His word in a matter is a pledge without an oath.
- 26.21. Do not set a due date for someone while another (date) is in your heart.
- 26.22. What is in the heart of the wise man is what one finds on his tongue.
- 26.23. Do not draw back from what you have said except from a lawless wrong.
- 26.24. The honor of the true and wise scribe is in his words.
- 27.1. Do not cheat when you are questioned, there being a witness behind you.

The sayings elaborate the topic of trust and honesty. The opening programmatic command not to cheat is repeated in the closing line, forming an *inclusio* and emphasizing the main idea. The units within the main body alternate between direct commands and declarative statements. Recurrent key words such as "word", "wise", "pledge", and "heart" bind the cluster together.⁴⁸

Papyrus Insinger also makes use of a repeated pattern within a small group of sayings appended to each instruction, consisting of "two [gnomic] pairs of paradoxical sayings, followed by two [gnomic] sentences that drew conclusions from them, and ending in a one-line [theologically-oriented] refrain about Fate and Fortune doing their work by the will of God....The whole sequence has a fixed pattern consisting of three elements: observation, explication, and conclusion."⁴⁹ The elaborative progression is signalled by formal shifts in the syntax of the sentences.⁵⁰ Lichtheim cites this example:

[Observation] There is one who lives on little so as to save, yet he becomes poor./ There is one who does not know, yet fate gives

110, and Kayatz, *Studien*, 21-22, who states, "...ein Leitgedanke wird auf die mannigfachsten Bereiche und Bezüge angewandt."

⁴⁸ Walter T. Wilson, *The Mysteries of Righteousness: The Literary Composition and Genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, TSAJ 40 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994), 37.

⁴⁹ Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 139.

⁵⁰ "The first pair is made up of two statements of the type, 'There is he who' (*wn p3 nty*), while the second pair contains negations introduced by the negative particle *bn*" ("Observations," 299).

(him) wealth.” [Explication] “It is not the wise man who finds a surplus./ Nor is it the one who spends who becomes poor.” [Conclusion] “The god gives a wealth of supplies without an income./ He also gives poverty in the purse without spending./ The fate and the fortune that come, it is the god who sends them (Insinger 7,13-19).

This *repeated elaborative and syntactical pattern* moves from wisdom observations of the anomalies of human affairs to a God-oriented conclusion.

Anksheshonq’s and *Insinger*’s preference for the monostichic form as well as the looser structure of their speeches are due to the influence of Greek gnomologia upon late Egyptian wisdom.⁵¹ Nevertheless, attempts (particularly *Insinger*) to retain some structuring devices of traditional Egyptian instructional speeches demonstrate how wisdom texts produced in the Hellenistic age could incorporate compositional features from both native and Greek cultures.⁵² Kayatz notes that the appearance of a simple form (monostich) in late Egyptian wisdom texts “spricht gegen die Konstruktion einer geradlinigen Entwicklung von kurzen Sprüchen zu größeren Einheiten.”⁵³

*Instructional Compositions in Proverbs 1-9*⁵⁴

Proverbs scholars agree that the Egyptian Instructions influenced the composition of the speeches in Prov 1-9, though they differ

⁵¹ Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 114.

⁵² Lichtheim describes *Insinger* as a “hybrid” (“Observations,” 290); see also Kayatz, *Studien*, 21.

⁵³ Kayatz, *Studien*, 23; see also 3-4, 19. Bernard Lang, *Die weisheitliche Lehrrede: Eine Untersuchung von Sprüche 1-7*, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 54 (Stuttgart: KBW, 1972), 36, states, “Hier gilt es, das formgeschichtliche Mißverständnis der Lehrrede zu überwinden, das in der Lehrrede eine Erweiterung des Einzelspruchs sah.” McKane, *Proverbs*, 7, states, “The conclusion to be drawn is that the formal structure of [Proverbs] 1-9, 22.17-24.22 and 31.1-9 is that of an international Instruction genre, and that it is not the consequence of a process of form-critical evolution involving the agglomeration of wisdom sentences.” See also Krispenz, *Spruchkompositionen*, 141, note 2, and Scoralick, *Einzelspruch und Sammlung*, 4-5.

⁵⁴ For analyses proposing the presence of sayings compositions in Prov 10-30 see R. N. Whybray, *The Composition of the Book of Proverbs*, JSOTSuppl 168 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 82-87, Hans-Jürgen Hermisson, *Studien zur Israelitischen*

over the directness of that influence and its precise date.⁵⁵ Lang has identified ten instructional speeches in Prov 1-9 (1:8-10; 2:1-22; 3:1-12; 3:21-35; 4:1-9; 4:10-19; 4:20-27; 5:1-23; 6:20-35; 7:1-27) and proposed for them a recurrent compositional pattern. (1) Each begins with a "call to heed" addressed to the student as "my son," followed by exhortations not to despise or forget the teachings, which are in turn described as valuable, useful, and worthy of being appropriated (2:1-11; 3:1-4; 3:21-26; 4:1f; 4:10-13; 4:20-22; 5:1f; 6:20-24; 7:1-4). Then follows (2) the main body containing a specific topic of instruction, set forth in a series of admonitions. (3) The speeches are concluded by short, gnomic units which set forth the respective consequences of wise or unwise behavior and feature a shift from the second-person appeal of the main body to observations in the third person (for example, 1:17-19; 3:32-35; 5:21-23). This three-fold structure is a general pattern which admits of variation.⁵⁶ Plöger's analysis is similar to Lang's. He notes, however, that the transition from the opening "call to heed" to the main body is sometimes marked by a new call to heed, and that the conclusion is often cumulative, referring back to both the exhortations of the opening "call to heed" and the specific instructions of the main body.⁵⁷ Gnostic sayings appear in support specific admonitions.⁵⁸ Other literary

Spruchweisheit, WMANT 28 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968), 171-72, 182, Römheld, *Formgeschichte*, 9, Otto Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)*, BKAT 17 (Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977), 123-24, 188-91, Krispenz, *Spruchkompositionen*, passim, Scoralick, *Einzelsspruch und Sammlung*, passim, and van Leeuwen, *Context and Meaning*, 30-31, 73-84. This research initiative is particularly important given the fact that these chapters of Proverbs have traditionally been viewed as being not much more than loose sayings collections.

⁵⁵ See Kayatz, *Studien*, 75, 135, McKane, *Proverbs*, 8-9, Lang, *Lehrrede*, 60, 101-102, and Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 12.

⁵⁶ Lang, *Lehrrede*, 29, 31-34, 100. For example, some of the instructions Lang identifies lack the concluding comparison of fates, such as 4:20-27 (see *Lehrrede*, 34, note 24; also Kayatz, *Studien*, 40). Whybray, *Composition*, 12-25, identifies them as 1:8-19, 4:10-19; 4:20-27; 2:1-22; 3:1-12; 3:21-35; 4:1-9; 5:1-23; 6:20-35; 7:1-27. Römheld, *Formgeschichte*, 129-131, notes that the "call to heed" in the Egyptian Instructions is always part of either a prologue or an epilogue and never incorporated into the individual instructional speeches.

⁵⁷ Plöger, *Sprüche*, xx-xxi, 23-24.

⁵⁸ James L. Crenshaw, "Wisdom and Authority: Sapiential Rhetoric and Its Warrants," in *Congress Volume*, Vienna, 1980, ed. J. A. Emerton, VTSuppl 32 (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 10-29, esp. 13-15. He cites 1:17 and 9:17.

forms such as paired rhetorical questions⁵⁹ and a “Beispielierzählung”⁶⁰ are also deployed.

Prov 5:1-23 exhibits this compositional pattern:

(1) *Call to Heed*

Call to Heed (vv. 1-2):	My child, be attentive to my wisdom; incline your ear to my understanding, so that you may hold on to prudence, and your lips may guard knowledge.
Extended Motive (vv. 3-6):	For the lips of a loose woman drip honey....her ways wander, and she does not know it.

(2) *Instructional Body*

Resumptive Call to Heed (v. 7): And now, my child, listen to me, and do not depart from the words of my mouth.

Programmatic Admonition (v. 8):	Keep your way far from her, and do not go near the door of her house;
Motive Clauses (vv. 9-14):	or you will give your honor to others...strangers will take their fill of your wealth...and at the end of your life you will groan, when your flesh and body are consumed...and you say.... ‘Now I am at the point of utter ruin in the public assembly.’

Reiterative Admonition (v. 15):	Drink water from your own cistern, flowing water from your own well.
Motives, jussives (vv. 16-18)	Should your springs be scattered abroad, streams of water in the streets? Let them be for yourself alone, and not for sharing with strangers....Let your fountain be blessed, and rejoice in the wife of your youth, a lovely deer, a graceful doe, may her breasts satisfy you at all times

⁵⁹ Crenshaw, “Sapiential Rhetoric,” 14, citing 6:27-28.

⁶⁰ Römheld, *Formgeschichte*, 129, referring to 7:6-23.

- Rhetorical Question, inclusio: Why should you be intoxicated, my son, by another woman and embrace the bosom of an adulteress?
- Gnomic Observation (v. 21): For human ways are under the eyes of the Lord, and he examines all their paths.

(3) *Conclusion*

- Fate of the Wicked (vv. 22-23): The iniquities of the wicked ensnare them....They die for lack of discipline, and because of their great folly they are lost.

The theme of the main body is anticipated in the opening “call to heed,” where it functions as an extended motive. The reiteration of the “call to heed” in v. 7 effects a transition to the instructional section after the long motive clause. The instructional section is divided into two argumentative panels (verses 8-14; verses 15-20), each introduced by an admonition (verse 8, verse 15), and reflecting each other in a negative-positive reversal: the second panel describes how to escape the horrors of the first panel; the wife of one’s youth is contrasted to the adulteress and the joys of marital intimacy with the pains of adultery; the alluring body of one’s wife is contrasted to the wasting-away body of the foolish adulterer; strangers consume the wealth of the adulterer, the wife of one’s youth is shared with no one. Verse 20’s reference to the foreign woman forms an inclusio with the prohibition of congress with this woman which opened the instruction (v. 8). It is rounded off by a gnomic saying with a God-reference which also carries an implicit threat of divine sanction (verse 21). The concluding segment (verses 22-23) reflects on the fate of the wicked under the general theme of folly, just as the introduction referred to wisdom.⁶¹

Prov 7:1-27 is another balanced instructional composition in which 7:1-5 and 7:24-27 form a framework (“Gehorsamsforderungen”) around an extended exemplary narrative (“Beispiel-

⁶¹ This analysis is derived from observations of Lang, *Lehrrede*, 29-34, Kayatz, *Studien*, 62, Plöger, *Sprüche*, 53-54, 58, and Philip Johannes Nel, *The Structure and Ethos of the Wisdom Admonitions in Proverbs*, BZAW 158 (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1982), 61-62.

zählung"; 7:6-23) of an illicit encounter.⁶² Central to the narrative is a speech by the seductress (7:14-20). This example narrative is told from the perspective of the wisdom-teacher,⁶³ who appends a warning of impending doom (7:23).

At first sight this use of narrative seems an odd strategy for an instructional speech; McKane in fact complains that 7:6-23 constitutes "a clear departure from the formal elements of the genre."⁶⁴ However, this instruction is similar to an Egyptian instructional speech found in *Any* 7:20-8:3, where an extended recounting of a mother's exemplary care for her child is framed by opening and closing admonitions not to neglect the support of one's aged mother.⁶⁵ In both cases the instructional micro-genre "admonition" with its second-person address governs the composition by assuming the prominent framework position. It thus appropriates a descriptive mode of speech for its instructional purposes, though in any case the observational, monitory voice of the sage pervades even the narrative. The stage directions of the framework give the example narrative a powerful instructional role. This is a case in which *determination of the hierarchalizing arrangements ordered by the macro-structure is crucial to resolving the problem of genre for a composition which utilizes diverse micro-genres*. Merely nose-counting small forms is a barren exercise.

Greco-Roman Instructional Compositions

Deliberative Rhetoric

Greco-Roman rhetoric pervaded the Hellenistic world and influenced literary composition of all sorts; in turn rhetoric was influenced by literature. Winfried Trillitzsch states, "In der griechischen wie in der römischen Welt nahm die Rhetorik eine entscheidende Stellung ein. Namentlich zu Senecas Zeit gab es kaum eine Literaturgattung in Prosa und Poesie, die nicht von ihr beein-

⁶² Römheld, *Formgeschichte*, 129-30; also Kayatz, *Studien*, 61, and McKane, *Proverbs*, 332.

⁶³ Plöger, *Sprüche*, 75-76.

⁶⁴ McKane, *Proverbs*, 332; also Whybray, *Composition*, 26, who sees it as secondary.

⁶⁵ Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, 2.141.

flußt wurde.”⁶⁶ Moreover, in antiquity the boundary between oral performance and literature was permeable; composition took place in a “rhetorical environment.”⁶⁷ Rhetorical theoreticians systematized conventions for effective discourse already long in use; their systematizations then reacted upon the production of new discourse, spoken or textual.

Maxims figured large in rhetorical theory. The maxim was the major component of Aristotle’s fundamental unit of deliberative argumentation, the enthymeme, for as a piece of wisdom commanding common (and hence the audience’s) assent, it supplied the premises of the argument and lent it immediate effectiveness. When a reason was added to the maxim, usually by means of a connective such as “for” or “because”, an enthymeme came into existence which in turn supplied the starting point for a series of supporting arguments.⁶⁸ Aristotle did not restrict the enthymeme to the threshold of the argument, rather, it might appear anywhere in the course of an argument where the rhetor deemed it appropriate, for Aristotle considered *enthymemes* and *examples* the two fundamental modes of deliberative proof, and an enthymeme appearing in the body frequently had its premises supplied or reinforced by preceding proofs or examples.⁶⁹ Anywhere one might use a maxim one could convert it to an enthymeme by supplying a reason. Aristotle’s only concern was that tedium not be induced by piling enthymeme upon enthymeme.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Winfried Trillitzsch, *Senecas Beweisführung*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft 37 (Berlin: Akademie, 1962), 12; see also Fischel, “Story and History,” 444-45.

⁶⁷ Vernon K. Robbins, “Progymnastic Rhetorical Composition and Pre-Gospel Traditions. A New Approach,” in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, 111-47, esp. 118, 120; Downing, “Word Processing,” passim.

⁶⁸ Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica*, LCL, I.2.8-15; II.20.1; II.21.2-3; III.17.17; also, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, LCL, IV.xvii.24-25; Quintilian, *Institutes*, LCL, VIII.v.3-4; Trillitzsch, *Senecas Beweisführung*, 13; see also Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft* (München: Max Hueber, 1960), 1.433.

⁶⁹ Thomas M. Conley, “The Enthymeme in Perspective,” *QJS* 70 (1984) 168-87, esp. 170, 175, 182-83; see also Lloyd F. Bitzer, “Aristotle’s Enthymeme Revisited,” *QJS* 45 (1959) 399-408.

⁷⁰ *Ars Rhetorica* I.2.8, 10; II.17.6, 20.1; for Quintilian also, maxims could appear in a speech with or without a reason appended (VIII.v.3-4; also *Ad Herennium* IV.xvii.24-25).

An example of an enthymeme is: *maxim*: "There is no man who is really free"; *reason*: "For he is the slave of either wealth or fortune."⁷¹ The affinity of this form with basic forms of Egyptian wisdom argumentation is obvious; clearly Aristotle is systematizing an ancient form of wisdom discourse under the rubric of deliberative rhetoric.⁷² The fact that for Aristotle the enthymemic maxim + reason is convertible to admonition + reason makes the relationship with wisdom even clearer: *admonition*: "No man who is sensible ought to have his children taught to be excessively clever"; *double reason*: "For not to speak of the charge of idleness brought against them, they earn jealous hostility from the citizens."⁷³ Especially figurative or enigmatic opening maxims need clarifying reason clauses.⁷⁴ The grounding clause can itself be a maxim which exegetes the opening maxim; moreover, an enthymeme can have more than one grounding clause: "Believe that many precepts are better than much wealth, *for* wealth quickly fails us, but precepts abide through all time; *for* wisdom alone of all possessions is imperishable."⁷⁵ Doubled or tripled motive clauses were seen to be a common feature of Egyptian instructional speeches.

As noted, maxims were viewed as powerful mechanisms of persuasion, drawing potency from the collective assent given to the verity of the proverbial observation and from their capacity to evoke shared values in a visceral manner.⁷⁶ The rhetor could insert maxims anywhere in a speech where they might be effective, though when employed as a means of proof, they belonged

⁷¹ *Ars Rhetorica* II.21.3.

⁷² Aristotle's definition of the enthymemic maxim is virtually a classic definition of a gnomic saying: "...it is evident that the materials from which enthymemes are derived will be sometimes necessary [like dialectical, philosophical premises], but for the most part only generally true; and these materials being probabilities and signs....that which is probable is that which generally happens..." (*Ars Rhetorica* I.2.15). See Josef Martin, *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II.3 (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1974), 103, and Mack, *Rhetoric*, 38-39.

⁷³ *Ars Rhetorica* II.21.2-3.

⁷⁴ Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.432-33; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 123.

⁷⁵ Pseudo-Isocrates, *Ad Demonium*, 19; see Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 43-44.

⁷⁶ *Ars Rhetorica* I.15.14, II.21.11, 15; see also Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.431, and Ian H. Henderson, "Quintilian and the Progymnasmata," *AntAb* 37 (1991) 82-99, esp. 85, 98.

in the argumentative body.⁷⁷ They were deemed to be particularly effective in the emphatic final position after a course of argument, where the maxim's affective (pathetical) powers could be exploited.⁷⁸ When used judiciously, maxims increased a speech's persuasiveness by lending it the elegance of well-turned language as well as by enhancing the authority of the speaker.⁷⁹ Knowledge of Egyptian and Israelite materials saves one from erroneously supposing that Greco-Roman rhetoricians invented the theory of the use of maxims in deliberative (or forensic or epideictic) speech. Rather they gave a distinctly Greek codification to millennia-old usages of sapiential discourse.

The handbooks classified illustrative rhetorical devices under various heads. An exemplum or paradigm strictly speaking was drawn from either actual or mythological history and was considered an especially effective persuasive device because it appeared to establish a precedent for the issue at stake.⁸⁰ Fables, parables, analogies, similitudes, and comparisons were illustrative devices not drawn from actual or mythological history but from nature, daily occurrences in human life, or from an inventory of fictional stories, all of which could be taken from literature or produced by the rhetor from raw materials supplied by culture and social setting.⁸¹ Examples normally were kept brief; however, it was not unusual for them to assume the proportions of a longer narrative or description.⁸² The example derived its persuasive power

⁷⁷ Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.433.

⁷⁸ Quintilian 8.5.10-13; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.434; Wilson, *Love Without Pre-tence*, 49; Carruth, "Persuasion," 158, 172.

⁷⁹ Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.431; *Ad Herennium* IV.xvii.25; *Ars Rhetorica* II.21.16; excessive use could have the opposite effect; see Henderson, "Quintilian," 83.

⁸⁰ *Ars Rhetorica* II.20.7-8; Quintilian XII.iv.1-2; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.228, 232; Mack, "Elaboration of the Chreia," 60; idem, *Rhetoric*, 40; Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1146-47.

⁸¹ Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.232-22; Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1113; *Ars Rhetorica* II.20.3-8; Quintilian XII.iv.1-2; Mack, *Rhetoric*, 40. Quintilian ascribed great persuasive power to those taken from canonical literature. Lists of stock categories aided the rhetor in discovery of appropriate materials and arguments: ancestry, education, city and fatherland, one's character, one's family (topics establishing the good character of one's subject, be he or she a defendant or plaintiff in judicial settings, or a sage in deliberative settings). Cultural values were accessed through such codes as the lawful, expedient, honorable, feasible, and necessary. See Mack, *Rhetoric*, 32; idem, "Elaboration of the Chreia," 38, Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.146, 201-202, and Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 95-96, 107.

⁸² Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.232.

from the impression it gave of laying down a disinterested precedent (be it from history, nature, socio-cultural norms, or authoritative literature), from the seductive charm of an apt story, and from its capacity to link the issue being argued with socio-cultural norms and general beliefs held by the audience.⁸³ Thus it functioned rhetorically in much the same manner as the maxim.⁸⁴ However, the most effective placement of the example was considered to be, not the opening position, but *after* an opening or preceding enthymeme, where it functioned in a manner similar to a supportive piece of evidence.⁸⁵ As a guard against monotony, rhetoricians recommended that diverse figures and examples be interspersed among enthymemes.⁸⁶ Apt use of examples kept the audience attentive to the course of the argument, whereas an argument consisting almost entirely of enthymemes induced tedium, impairing the rhetor's capacity to persuade.⁸⁷

While handbooks focused attention on effective arrangement of argumentative speeches, they emphasized that there was no one proper order. Rather, it was up to the rhetor to organize arguments according to the demands of the speech-situation.⁸⁸ Theoreticians gave different outlines which might include an introduction (*exordium*, sometimes deemed unnecessary), if appropriate a statement of the facts (*narratio*), proposition, which clearly and succinctly states the issue to be argued, proofs, and conclusion (*peroratio*).⁸⁹ This basic arrangement was influenced by the judi-

⁸³ Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.230-31; 234-35, 419; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 122; Mack, "Elaboration of the Chreia," 38.

⁸⁴ *Ars Rhetorica* I.2.8, 10; II.20.1. Closely related to both the maxim and the example was citation from authoritative individuals, be they sages, famous citizens, famous poets, or even divine oracles and omens (Quintilian V.xi.36-42; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 122; Mack, "Elaboration of the Chreia," 60-61). The concern in the selection of materials for one's speech was to gain *authority* for one's person and proposals.

⁸⁵ *Ars Rhetorica* II.20.9; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 120.

⁸⁶ Quintilian, V. xiv. 27-32; Cicero, *de Inventione*, LCL, I. 41.76; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 136.

⁸⁷ Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 119; *Ars Rhetorica* II.17.6.

⁸⁸ Quintilian VII.Pr.4; Cicero, *de Oratore*, LCL, II.lxxvii.307-308; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.241; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 218-19.

⁸⁹ Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica* III.13.14, for example, lists exordium, statement, proofs, and epilogue as the four basic parts of a speech (but he also states that the speech basically has two parts: statement of the subject and its proofs [III.12.3]). See also Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.163-64, 190, and Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 92, 221.

cial setting; theoreticians were less specific about the possible dispositions to be given to deliberative or epideictic rhetoric. The proofs were the essential part of any speech; even the proposition could fall away if the issue at stake was well-known.⁹⁰ Some form of conclusion fulfilling the tasks of (a) a brief, retrospective recapitulation of the essential point(s) (frequently stated prospectively at the beginning), and (b) a final, affective appeal to the audience, was also important.⁹¹ The applicability of the handbooks' speech-arrangements to form-critical literary analysis is complicated by the fact that the theoreticians have in view the oral delivery situation (particularly the court-setting), and thus are constantly qualifying and noting exceptions to the basic *dispositio* demanded by the exigencies of different situations. Nevertheless, the skeleton of the *dispositio*, consisting of a programmatic opening, a course of supportive argumentation, and a recapitulating conclusion bears some resemblance to the basic compositional plan of the instructional speeches studied so far.

Chreia Elaboration

A chreia is a gnomic saying attributed to an historical personage under the heading of "[So and so] said/used to say."⁹² This basic pattern permits a range of variations. Frequently chreiaic sayings are responses either to an interlocutor's question or to a situation observed by the sage, or instead of a uttering a gnomic saying or aphorism the sage may take a significance-laden action in response to a question or situation.⁹³ In mixed chreias the sage's response is a wise, witty, or aphoristic saying accompanied by an action, sometimes with emphasis upon the action.⁹⁴ A dou-

⁹⁰ Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 221.

⁹¹ Quintilian VI.i.1-2; *Ad Herennium* II.xxx.47-48; Cicero, *de Inventione* I.ii.1; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.236-39; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 148-51, 221.

⁹² *Theon of Alexandria*, 36-40; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.536; Mack, "Elaboration of the Chreia," 45; Crossan, *In Fragments*, 229; Hock and O'Neil, *Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, 26. Wilson, *Mysteries*, 16, states that "a chreia betrays a biographical interest alongside the didactic one."

⁹³ Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata*, 19-29; *Theon* 1-8; Quintilian I.ix. 1-6; Buchanan, "Chreias in the New Testament," 504; James R. Butts, "The Chreia in the Synoptic Gospels," *BTB* 16 (1986) 132-38, esp. 133.

⁹⁴ *Theon*, 78-79; Butts, "The Chreia," 132; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.539.

ble chreia is expressed when a saying is delivered as a retort to an initial pronouncement by an interlocutor.⁹⁵

The chreia has a strong instructional flavor and hence was used in instructional contexts to inculcate adherence to a particular, at times counter-cultural mode of life, with its "pointed conclusion" in such cases serving to challenge conventional notions and stereotypes.⁹⁶ Because of its instructional affinities a chreia could be expanded by more or less extended courses of argument in support of the maxim delivered by the sage.⁹⁷ In chreia collections extended speeches attached to chreias are rare (see below). However, expansion of chreias into complete deliberative arguments were in fact written exercises (*progymnasmata*, "preliminary exercises") assigned to students in lower levels of the schools of rhetoric. The exercises inculcated the skill of discovery of arguments (*inventio*) so crucial to the vocation of the rhetor.⁹⁸ The specimens of the chreia elaboration that have come down to us, therefore, show how rhetoric interacted with literary composition.

The wise, witty, or aphoristic saying provided the program-

⁹⁵ Theon 84-93; Hock and O'Neil, *Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, 32; Hezser, "Verwendung," 371-73. Theon cites as an example: "Alexander the Macedonian king stood over Diogenes as he slept and said (*Il.* 2.24): 'To sleep all night ill suits a counsellor,' and Diogenes responded (*Il.* 2.25): 'On whom the folk rely, whose cares are many'."

⁹⁶ For Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata*, 1-3, the chreia was to engender "something useful." Nicolaus of Myra, 142-151, classified the chreia with deliberative rhetoric, "for it always urges us to something good or restrains us from something evil...." See also Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.536: "eine lehrreiche kurze Anekdote, die eine Sentenzweisheit als Realität des praktischen Lebens erweist....Die historische Persönlichkeit...dient als konkrete Autoritätsstütze für die praktische Gültigkeit der Sentenz...." See also Robbins, "The Chreia," 4, 16, idem, "Chreia and Pronouncement Story in Synoptic Studies," in *Patterns of Persuasion*, 1-29, esp. 16, Gammie, "Paraenetic Literature," 55-56, Hezser, "Verwendung," 371-74, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 315.

⁹⁷ Theon, 115-123, 127-132, lists some chreias where the saying is supported by the addition of one or two confirming clauses, for example, "Diogenes said that courtesans of kings are their queens, *for* (γάρ) they do whatever the courtesans want." See also Vernon K. Robbins, "The Chreia," in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*, ed. David E. Aune, SBLSPS 21 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 1-24, esp. 3, and Rees Conrad Douglas, "'Love Your Enemies': Rhetoric, Tradents, and Ethos," in *Conflict and Invention*, 116-31, esp. 117.

⁹⁸ Quintilian I. ix. 1-6; Hermogenes, 31-62; Mack, *Rhetoric*, 43-44; Hock and O'Neil, *Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, 15, 35, 137; Michael Humphries, "The Kingdom of God in the Q Version of the Beelzebul Controversy," *Forum* 9/1-2 (1993) 121-50, esp. 123.

matic thesis for the course of argumentation. The following elaboration is from Hermogenes 35-62:

- Praise:* "Isocrates was wise" plus moderate amplification.
Chreia: *Isocrates said that education's root is bitter, its fruit is sweet.*
Rationale: For the most important affairs generally succeed because of toil, and once they have succeeded, they bring pleasure.
Contrary: For ordinary affairs do not need toil, and they have an outcome that is entirely without pleasure; but serious affairs have the opposite outcome.
Analogy: For just as it is the lot of farmers to reap their fruits after working with the land, so also is it for those working with words.
Example: Demosthenes, after locking himself in a room and toiling long, later reaped his fruits: wreaths and public acclamations.
Authority: Hesiod said (*Op.* 289): "In front of virtue the gods have ordained sweat." And another poet says (Epicharmus, 287 Kaibel): "At the price of toil do the gods sell every good to us."
Exhortation: (At the end you are to add an exhortation to the effect that it is necessary to heed the one who has spoken or acted.)

The first rhetorical move, "Praise," establishes the wise character of Isocrates and legitimates him as a sage. Naturally, this takes place before the actual wisdom is expressed. Then the chreia + rationale creates a programmatic enthymeme stating the thesis to be argued, with the rationale serving to decode the figurative maxim and state it in plain, arguable language.⁹⁹ The argumentative maneuvers which follow are drawn from the general categories established to help rhetors discover arguments.¹⁰⁰ Mack argues that Hermogenes' chain of arguments "moved the topic ahead toward ever greater specificity and concretation," for general arguments are placed at the beginning of the elaboration and specific examples of education and acquiring virtue toward its end. In addition, references to the sanctioning gods appear at the climactic end of the chain. This general-to-specific,

⁹⁹ *Ars Rhetorica* II. 21.8; Mack, *Rhetoric*, 45.

¹⁰⁰ Hock and O'Neil, *Chreia*, 15; Robbins, "Rhetorical Composition," 132.

human-to-divine gradation of the elaboration concludes in an exhortation which makes specific application of the chreia to the projected audience. At the same time the final exhortation effects closure by returning to Isocrates' programmatic opening chreia.¹⁰¹

The sequence of the chreia elaboration, counseling against excessive grief, which governs the composition of Epistle 21 of *The Epistles of Socrates and the Socratics*, "Aeschines to Xanthippe, the Wife of Socrates," can be set out as follows:¹⁰²

<i>Thesis & Rationale:</i>	Let the abundance of tears that you have shed suffice. For they will do no good, but rather harm.
<i>Paradigm & Rationale:</i>	Remember what Socrates used to say and follow his customs and advice, for by grieving constantly you will harm both yourself and especially your children.
<i>Comparison:</i>	For they are, as it were, the nestlings of Socrates, and we must not only feed them, but we ourselves must also try to remain alive with them.
<i>Argument from Contrary:</i>	Since if you or I or anyone else who cares about the children of the dead Socrates should die, they will suffer harm....Therefore, try to stay alive for them. But you cannot do this if you do not provide yourself with the necessities of your own life.
<i>Gnomic Saying:</i>	<i>Grief seems to be among the enemies of life, since the living are harmed by it.</i> ¹⁰³
<i>Praise; Opinion:</i>	Apollodorus...and Dio praise you, because you are not receiving anything from anyone and yet you say you are rich.
<i>Promise:</i>	In that, you are right. For as long as I and the other friends have the power to help you,

¹⁰¹ Mack, *Rhetoric*, 46; idem, "Elaboration of the Chreia," 62. Vernon K. Robbins, "Introduction: Using Rhetorical Discussions of the Chreia to Interpret Pronouncement Stories," in *Rhetoric of Pronouncement*, vii-xvii, notes the compositional pattern, "chreia expansion", is distinguished by its delay of "the statement and/or its rationale to the end of the story" (ix).

¹⁰² Translated by Stanley Stowers, in *The Cynic Epistles*, edited by Abraham J. Malherbe; SBLSBS 12 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).

¹⁰³ Λύπη δὲ δοκεῖ τῶν ἐναντίων ζῶν εἶναι, ὅπου βλάπτονται ὑπ' αὐτῆς οἱ ζῶντες.

you will lack nothing.
Admonition; Inclusio: So, take courage, Xanthippe, and do not discard any of the good instructions of Socrates...and meditate on how he lived and how he died.¹⁰⁴

The opening paradigm/rationale and closing admonitions, both of which appeal to the Socratic paradigm, form an *inclusio*; further, the concluding admonition restates positively the opening admonition's warning against excessive sorrow. A *central gnomic saying* epitomizing the deliberative issue at stake is another prominent feature. The composition also progresses in a linear manner from prohibitions and negative arguments to concluding promises and a positive admonition.

Lehrgedicht, Gnomologium, Chreia Collection

Greek wisdom literature is often viewed under the rubric "gnomologia."¹⁰⁵ Though frequently surviving in the form of such collections, Greco-Roman wisdom appears in a variety of genres that cover the spectrum from loose collections of individual sayings to more integrated and complex compositions.¹⁰⁶ Using "gnomologia" as an umbrella term tends to make the gnomologium's looseness of form a ubiquitous property of Greek wisdom texts, in turn leading to the erroneous generalization that compositional techniques in those texts rarely rise above the relative unsophistication of thematic association, catchword connection, and formal analogy.¹⁰⁷ Wilson does argue that other techniques such as *inclusio*, ring composition, and chiasm occur in some texts, and he as well as Kloppenborg and Küchler note that groupings of sayings in some texts at times achieve the stature of modest in-

¹⁰⁴ See Benjamin Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*, AnBib 105 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 142.

¹⁰⁵ John Barns, "A New Gnomologium: With Some Remarks on Gnomonic Anthologies," *ClassQ* 44 (1950) 126-37; 45 (1951) 1-19, esp. 132; Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 72.

¹⁰⁶ See van Groningen, *Composition*, 8-10, 33-37.

¹⁰⁷ Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1068-69; Pascale Derron, *Pseudo-Phocylide Sentences* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1986), xx-xxi; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 310-11; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 258-61; Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 27-28; Wilson, *Mysteries*, 17; idem, *Love Without Pretence*, 68-69, 72-74. Criticizing this generalization is Thomas, *Phokylides*, 32-33.

structional elaborations.¹⁰⁸ A distinction can be made, however, between complex forms such as the wisdom poem (*Lehrgedicht*), collections held together by means of much looser compositional techniques (anthologies, florilegia, gnomologia), and texts displaying intermediate degrees of complexity (chreia collections, "paraenesis"). Wisdom texts should also be distinguished with regard to the pragmatic intent spurring their production, which can range from utility as reference works for rhetors, to training in general socio-cultural norms, to highly focused protreptic and indoctrination into philosophical-religious sects.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, while different levels of compositional sophistication are evident within Hellenistic wisdom texts, distinct generic boundaries are hard to draw.¹¹⁰ As an introduction to this problem we shall survey three divergent wisdom macro-forms which appear in Greco-Roman literature: the wisdom poem, the gnomologium, and the chreia collection.

The paradigmatic model for the Greco-Roman wisdom poem (*Lehrgedicht*) was Hesiod's *Works and Days*.¹¹¹ Characteristic of the *Works and Days* is the diversity of smaller genres which it incorporates; most striking is the contrast between the extended prologue (1-334), characterized by accusation, invective, autobiography, fables, myths, mythical figures, and threats of divine sanction, and the more serene, homogeneous instructions on agricultural work which also treat such topoi as friendship, reciprocity, and marriage (335-825).¹¹² In the prologue the projected audience alternates several times between the main addressee—Hesiod's

¹⁰⁸ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 72-74; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 250; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 298-99.

¹⁰⁹ Thomas, *Phokylides*, 245; for example: gnostic anthologies, paraenetic texts such as *Ad Demonium*, philosophical-religious texts such as the Pythagorean *Golden Verses*. On the soteriological function of the *Golden Verses* see Zeller, "Grundschrift," 399.

¹¹⁰ Johan C. Thom, *The Pythagorean Golden Verses With Introduction and Commentary*, RGRW 123 (Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995), 71. See also Konstantin Horna and K. von Fritz, "Gnome, Gnomendichtung, Gnomologien," *PWSuppl.* 6 (1935), 74-90.

¹¹¹ L. L. Albertsen, *Das Lehrgedicht. Eine Geschichte der antikisierenden Sachepik in der neueren deutschen Literatur mit einem unbekannten Gedicht Albrecht von Hallers* (Aarhus: Akademisk Boghandel, 1967), 40, 54-55; Wilhelm Kroll, "Lehrgedicht," *PRE* 24, 1842-57, esp. 1843-44.

¹¹² Kroll, "Lehrgedicht," 1844; Gese, "Weisheitsdichtung," 1577; Albertsen, *Lehrgedicht*, 42-45, 54-55 (noting that generic diversity is a characteristic of the

brother Perses—and corrupt aristocratic judges.¹¹³ Reproach, threat, polemic, and narrative intermingle with paraenesis.¹¹⁴ Despite this diversity, the notion that the present text of the *Works and Days* is disordered or layered has not been defended in Hesiod scholarship for over seventy years; rather, the text is recognized to be a cohesive, coherent unity, the product of oral composition.¹¹⁵ The myths of the two Strifes, Prometheus, Pandora, and the World Ages account for the current corruption which besets the world and hence explain the harsh necessity of work.¹¹⁶ The world is a degenerate, disordered place, full of injustice, and ripe for the wrath of Zeus who upholds the order of justice.¹¹⁷ Hesiod's work-paraenesis directed to the foolish Perses is intended as a remedy for the latter's entanglement in this corruption and to help him salvage a just and blessed life through honest work

ancient *Lehrgedicht*); Manfred Erren, "Die Anredestruktur im archaischen Lehrgedicht," in *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, eds. Wolfgang Kullmann and Michael Reichel, Scripta Oralialia 30, Reihe A, Band 9 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1990), 186-97, esp. 188; Jens-Uwe Schmidt, *Adressat und Paraineseform. Zur Intention von Hesiods 'Werken und Tagen'*, Hypomnemata 86 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 20-21, 57; M. L. West, introduction to *Hesiod Works and Days*, edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by M. L. West (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 1, 24, 41; van Groningen, *Composition*, 297; W. J. Verdenius, "Aufbau und Absicht der Erga," in *Hésiode et son Influence* (Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1962), 109-59, esp. 158-59

¹¹³ West, "Introduction," 1, 23; Schmidt, *Adressat*, 36, 100-101; Julia Kerschensteiner, "Zu Aufbau und Gedankenführung von Hesiods Erga," *Hermes* 78-79 (1943-44) 149-91, esp. 173; Kumaniecki, "Structure," 84; Walter Nicolai, *Hesiods Erga. Beobachtungen zum Aufbau* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter; Universitätsverlag, 1964), 54.

¹¹⁴ Kumaniecki, "Structure," 90-92; Kerschensteiner, "Zu Aufbau," 172, 176-77; Nicolai, *Erga*, 24 ("erweist sich die 'Persönliche Invektive' Satz für Satz als Legierung paraenetischer und exponierender Elemente"); van Groningen, *Composition*, 297.

¹¹⁵ Schmidt, *Adressat*, 12-13, 36-37, 100-101; West, introduction to *Hesiod*, 23, 41-42; van Groningen, *Composition*, 297; Kerschensteiner, "Zu Aufbau," 149-50, 189; Kumaniecki, "Structure," 79, 93; Erren, "Anredestruktur," 190-91; Verdenius, "Aufbau," 156-57.

¹¹⁶ R. M. Fraser, *The Poems of Hesiod* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983), 96-97, 100; West, introduction to *Hesiod*, 48-49; Kerschensteiner, "Zu Aufbau," 172.

¹¹⁷ Fraser, *Poems*, 105; Theognis, *Elegies*, likewise is wisdom in response to social crisis, to a world perceived to be out of order; also in the Egyptian *Merikare*, *Amenemhet*, "und in den Klagen der sog. Mahnworte eines ägyptischen Weisen...[tritt] die Gefährdung der Ordnung stärker in das Blickfeld," along with an increased emphasis on judgment (Gese, "Weisheitsdichtung," 1579); see Thomas, *Phokylides*, 244.

and practical sagacity. Correspondingly, it is a means of rectifying a disordered society whose very leaders are corrupt and rapacious.¹¹⁸ Schmidt characterizes the opening section as “aufrüttelnde Parainese” and “Umstimmungsparainese,” which prepares for the instructions proper: “Anleitungsparainese.”¹¹⁹ The indignant description of the crisis of justice in the world is the propaedeutic for the work-paraenesis (intended as remedial wisdom), arousing as it does in an agitating, provocative manner the affects of the listeners and creating expectations that the instruction is of critical importance.¹²⁰ The technique of “catchword” connection between adjoining units, far from being merely mechanical (as the label implies), enables thematic progress by means of association of ideas.¹²¹ The entire composition may be bound together by means of a loosely-structured ring arrangement.¹²²

Gnomologia are collections of gnomic sayings brought together by editors under diverse perspectives and displaying different levels of arrangement ranging from virtual autonomy of individual units to catchword or thematic principles of association.¹²³ One common model for the production of gnomologia was collection of gnomic sayings from diverse authors and their arrangement by topics such as parents, family, friendship, women, marriage, riches, social relations, status, pleasure, and work. Collectors drew without discrimination from the works of philosophers, poets, comics, satirists and tragedians, grouping excerpts around these *topoi*.¹²⁴ This specific format—excerpts from diverse authors grouped thematically—is best explained by the pragmatic appli-

¹¹⁸ Schmidt, *Adressat*, 53, 63; Albertsen, *Lehrgedicht*, 42; Kroll, “Lehrgedicht, 1844; Kerschensteiner, “Zu Aufbau,” 176; Verdenius, “Aufbau,” 121, 134; Erren, “Anredestruktur,” 190-91.

¹¹⁹ Schmidt, *Adressat*, 84-96.

¹²⁰ Schmidt, *Adressat*, 18-20.

¹²¹ Nicolai, *Erga*, 55-56; Kumaniecki, “Structure,” 85, 89-91; Kerschensteiner, “Zu Aufbau,” 189; Verdenius, “Aufbau,” 118, 142, 146-47; Walcot, “Composition,” 11; see also Berkeley Peabody, *The Winged Word: A Study of the Technique of Ancient Greek Oral Composition as Seen Principally through Hesiod's Works and Days* (Albany: SUNY, 1975), 181-82.

¹²² Walcot, “Composition,” *passim*.

¹²³ Thomas, *Phokylides*, 135; van Groningen, *Composition*, 33, 67; Albertsen, *Lehrgedicht*, 54.

¹²⁴ Henry Chadwick, “Florilegium,” *RAC* 7 (1969), 1131-60, esp. 1132; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 237-38. Derron, *Sentences*, xiv-xv, suggests that the poets were anthologized first, and that only later were prose works excerpted.

cation of such collections within an educational system focused upon the formation of the rhetor. Quintilian laid down that pupils as part of their preparation be assigned essays on moral topics.¹²⁵ Anthologies arranged according to subject functioned as convenient reference works for students in search of moral topics, maxims, and chreias on which to expatiate. Such reference works were likely used by professional rhetors as aids for the discovery of effective maxims and arguments.¹²⁶ Simultaneously gnomologia served the second educational purpose of inculcation of moral norms and cultural values. The production of gnomologia was thus itself an aspect of the shift in Greek philosophy in the Hellenistic period towards more exclusive concern with ethical matters, and such works would likely have found a market with a wider public.¹²⁷ A common form taken by thematic collections was "antilogical," that is, antithetical topics arranged in balanced pairs according to a basic "praiseworthy—blameworthy" division. Examples of such pairings might be "On the Virtues," "On Vices" "On the Just," "On the Unjust." This technique for arrangement of groups of sayings was taken up by Stobaeus, but goes back far behind him to the sophistic roots of Greco-Roman education where emphasis was put upon arguing both sides of an issue.¹²⁸

Other gnomologia were collections of the sayings of one sage. Sometimes a philosophical school wished to preserve the teaching of its founder in an epitome. This in turn functioned variously as a protreptic advertisement for the teachings of the school, paraenesis for initiates, and as a charter document giving ideological cohesion and stability to the on-going philosophical-religious community. The Κύρια Δόξαι of Epicurus (Diogenes Laertius 10, 139-154), the pagan *Vorlage* of the *Sentences of Sextus*, and the *Golden Verses* of Pythagoras are exemplars of this type of text (though the *Verses* is better classified as a wisdom poem).¹²⁹ Other texts transmitted under the name of a single sage contained parae-

¹²⁵ Quintilian I.ix.1-6.

¹²⁶ van Groningen, *Composition*, 30, 32.

¹²⁷ Horna, von Fritz, "Gnome," 78-80; Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 77; Barns, "Gnomologium," 12-14.

¹²⁸ Barns, "Gnomologium," 5, 9; Derron, *Sentences*, xv-xvii.

¹²⁹ Chadwick, "Florilegium," 1138; Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 79-80; idem, *Mysteries*, 17; Thom, *Commentary*, 75; Robert Wilken, "Wisdom and Philosophy in Early Christianity," in *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed.

nesis of broader application, and any claims to represent the teaching of a certain school were muted in favor of placing the instruction in the framework of general civic and cultural values. Examples are Pseudo-Isocrates *Ad Demonicum* and Isocrates *Ad Nicoclem*, as well as *Dicta Catonis*. Again, boundaries are fluid, since in particular *Ad Demonicum* and *Ad Nicoclem* display a level of composition too sophisticated to permit their classification as excerpted collections or gnomologia.

Other gnomologia at least began as collections of citations from a single author—such as the playwrights Euripides and Menander—even if they absorbed extraneous material in the course of transmission. Some clever scholarly detective work has demonstrated that such florilegia were composed as anthologizers scrolled through alphabetically-arranged “Complete Works” editions of a given playwright, excerpting material along the way. The resulting anthology was probably published as a general anthology of a famous author organized in chapters titled in alphabetical order according to the names of the plays (some anthologized material centuries later was still being transmitted in chapters titled according to specific plays). Such anthologies were themselves later excerpted into thematically-organized collections. This is clear from the fact that in Byzantine topical anthologies going under the name of Menander or Euripides (or Sophocles), the majority of gnomic sayings in each topical group can be traced to that author’s plays with titles beginning either with A or Α or Y, that is, with either the first or latter letters of the Greek alphabet (for example, Sophocles’ *Ajax*). This indicates that the topical anthologizer scrolled either from the beginning or the end of an anthology already culled from an edition of a playwright’s complete works, scanning just long enough to find a sufficient number of pithy sayings on a theme before going on to another moral topic and repeating the process. Some of these topical anthologies came down to Stobaeus still containing largely authentic material from a single author; other sources, however, drew on multiple authors even though transmitted under a single name such as Menander. Some of these exhibited a chapter arrange-

Robert L. Wilken, *University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 1* (Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), 143-68.

ment following an alphabetical listing of themes, and within chapters individual units were themselves alphabetized according to their first letter, likely the result of Byzantine editorial interventions.¹³⁰ Yet another rearrangement of the gnomologia came in the Byzantine period, when any topical arrangement was abandoned in favor of monostichic versions in which each line was placed in an alphabetical arrangement according to its first letter. This entailed the pedantic and rather violent separation of originally double or multi-lined units of the earlier thematic anthologies into monostichs and the redistribution of the severed members into the new alphabetical sequence. This likely reflected a shift in pragmatic application: gnomologia were now used less as topical reference works in a lively rhetorical culture and more for individual edification.¹³¹

Chreias appear as small genres within all kinds of literary productions. However, the chreia collection is indeed a recurrent framework genre with distinguishing features. Chreia collections are similar to gnomologia with respect to the relatively loose manner in which the disparate materials are organized to form a single text, with the chreias arranged largely on fairly mechanical principles of association—though not thereby compromising the collection's focused instructional intent.¹³² Similarities in persons addressed (for example, three exchanges with Plato in Diogenes Laertius VI, 25-26), topic, and form (for example, four chreias in Diogenes Laertius VI, 65, each beginning with: οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ to do thus and such?) as well as catchwords (in the true sense of the word) serve as means for stringing materials together.¹³³ Concatenations of short chreias predominate, accom-

¹³⁰ Woldemar Görler, *MENANAIPOY ΓΝΩΜΑΙ* (Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin, 1963), discusses this course of development in detail; see especially 111-19, 132-33, 144, 147-49. The existence of early anthologies following an alphabetically arranged edition of a playwright's complete works is attested by papyrus finds (116-17). Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 237, notes that Meleagros of Gadara made a collection of epigrams (Στέφανος) from a series of authors organized alphabetically according to author, beginning from Archilochos and terminating with himself.

¹³¹ Görler, *ΓΝΩΜΑΙ*, 130-33; 144-45; Chadwick, "Florilegium," 1153; Deron, *Sentences*, xix, xxiii; Barns, "Gnomologium," 15-16; Lichtheim, *Late Egyptian Wisdom*, 187.

¹³² Hezser, "Verwendung," 383-84.

¹³³ Rudberg, "Diogenes-Tradition," 25, 37-42; Cancik, "Bios und Logos," 121-24; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 310-11.

panied at times by sequences of attributed sayings, but beyond motive clauses appended to gnomic sayings, only traces of expansions into longer speeches are found.¹³⁴ However, the chreia collection differs from the gnomologium not just in the predominance of the chreic form but in its use of the unifying framework device of the "Life" of the philosopher to whom the chreias are attributed. In the case of the *Lives* of Diogenes and Demonax, the collection is preceded by a section describing the origins and some elements of the career of the philosopher, including references to philosophical predecessors or contemporaries. Biographical elements then give way to the chreia collection proper (though the chreia is itself a somewhat biographical form), in turn succeeded by a concluding description of the philosopher's death (absent in some of the *Lives*).¹³⁵ In the case of Lucian's *Demonax*, the opening segment ends with the hero's trial and acquittal on the charge of *asebeia*. His success in the trial and, accordingly, his association with Socrates endow Demonax with legitimating authority for the body of teaching which follows.¹³⁶ Frameworking the philosopher's teaching by his life allows the chreia collection to function protreptically and the sage as a model for mimesis.¹³⁷

This overview of the wisdom poem, the gnomologium, and the chreia collection shows the variety of compositional models available to the wisdom composer of the Hellenistic period. Combination of elements from related wisdom genres was also an option; for example, Berger notes that *Pseudo-Phocylides* combines the genres of wisdom poem and gnomologium.¹³⁸

We turn now to further examination of the instructional speech form.

¹³⁴ Rudberg, "Diogenes-Tradition," 28-30, 32-33; Downing, "Quite Like Q," 197; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 311.

¹³⁵ Cancik, "Bios und Logos," 120-22; Downing, "Quite Like Q," 201, 203; idem, "Genre for Q," 6, 9; Branham, "Authorizing Humor," 38-39.

¹³⁶ Cancik, "Bios und Logos," 122; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 307-308, who adduces as well the legitimating trial endured by Secundus at the hand of Hadrian (*Sentences of Secundus*, edition in B. E. Perry, *Secundus the Silent Philosopher* [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1964]).

¹³⁷ Cancik, "Bios und Logos," 120-21, 124, 126; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 307.

¹³⁸ Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1046.

Sentences of Sextus

Though the *Sentences of Sextus* was appropriated and touched up by early Gentile Christianity (late second century), its *Vorlage* is a pagan gnomic text.¹³⁹ Its pragmatic intent is formation of an aspiring sage and the ethics it inculcates "reflect popular moral and religious ideas widespread in the Greco-Roman world" with a neo-Pythagorean impress.¹⁴⁰ The Christian redaction consisted of some vocabulary substitution and occasional insertion of lines, indicating that its pagan-philosophical ethics were highly amenable to the Christians who appropriated them.¹⁴¹ Hence *Sextus* offers the opportunity to study compositional techniques in a gnomologium.

It is difficult at first or even second glance to observe much compositional activity in *Sextus* beyond topical grouping. At times mechanistic use of catchwords creates chains of thematically unrelated sayings, surrounded in turn by long sequences of sayings with no obvious thematic, syntactic, or lexical interconnection at all.¹⁴² Though this characterization generally holds good, it is possible from time to time to detect the presence of more sophisticated arrangements. Kloppenborg notes that *Sextus* 1-5 is a sorites with a rhetorical climax,¹⁴³ and Wilson points out occasional occurrences of inclusio and an attempt to arrange groups of sayings according to the four-fold canon of cardinal virtues: wisdom, courage, moderation, and justice.¹⁴⁴ Other groupings

¹³⁹ Henry Chadwick, *The Sentences of Sextus. A Contribution to the History of Early Christian Ethics*, Texts and Studies 5, New Series (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1959), 141, 148, 153; Wilken, "Wisdom and Philosophy," 144-45. Traces of the same source, including agreements in order, are found in a letter of the neo-Platonist Porphyry.

¹⁴⁰ Wilken, "Wisdom and Philosophy," 152; see also 159, 165; Chadwick, *Sextus*, 140.

¹⁴¹ Wilken, "Wisdom and Philosophy," 153, 157; Chadwick, *Sextus*, 138, 159-60. According to Wilken, the Christian redactor on occasion substituted "faithful" for "wise" as well as adding words such as "elect" (1, 2, 35, 433), "image of God" (190), "kingdom of God" (311), "love the Lord your God" (422). Lines which appear to be Christian insertions are 13, 20, 41, 89, 110, 183, 193, 213, 242, 273, 442.

¹⁴² As Chadwick, *Sextus*, 153, and Wilken, "Wisdom and Philosophy," 145, concur.

¹⁴³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 299.

¹⁴⁴ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 74-75; idem, *Mysteries*, 51-52, where he isolates lines 167-182 as being built around the four cardinal virtues.

seem to display the structure of programmatic maxim + specific elaborative admonitions. An example is lines 67-72:

Programmatic General Maxim (67): The temperate man is pure in God's sight (σώφρων ἀνὴρ ἀγνὸς παρὰ τῷ θεῷ).

Specific Admonitions (68-71a): Flee licentiousness (ἀκολασίαν φεῦγε).
Exercise prudence.
Master pleasures (ἡδονῶν).
Conquer the body in every way.
Motive (71b): If you love pleasure you will not escape licentiousness (ἐκ φιληδονίας ἀκολασίαν οὐκ ἐκφεύξῃ).

Inclusio, Sanction(72): God does not listen to the one who loves pleasure (φιληδόνου ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει).¹⁴⁵

The opening maxim expresses the cardinal virtue of temperance, linking it to a close relationship with God. The maxim is then concretized in a chain of four short admonitions. These in turn are followed by a motive, in its turn followed by a maxim expressing a divine sanction which forms an antithetical *inclusio* with the opening maxim: the pure man (67) is contrasted with the pleasure-loving man (72); closeness to God (67) is contrasted with alienation from God (72). Line 72 also serves as a coordinating transition to the next small cluster (73-79) which deals with luxurious living and the passions, but the close recurrence of key words signals that 67-72 is to be taken as a discrete unit. The repetition of "licentiousness" and "flee" in lines 68 and 71 may signal an internal *inclusio*.

Another carefully composed cluster is *Sextus* 93-98:

Programmatic Admonition (93): Think carefully before undertaking any action lest you repeat an error. (σκέπτου πρὸ τοῦ πράττειν ἃ πράττεῖς ἵνα μὴ δις ποιῇς ἃ μὴ δεῖ)

Admonition (94): Whatever actions you do not want God to know, do not do. (ὃ πράττων οὐκ ἂν θέλοις εἰδέναι τὸν θεόν, τοῦτο μὴ πράξῃς)

¹⁴⁵ Text: *The Sentences of Sextus*, ed. and trans. Richard A. Edwards and Robert A Wild, SBLTT 22, Early Christian Literature Series 5 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1981).

- Admonition (95a):* Before you do anything, think about God. (πρὸ παντὸς οὗ πράττεις νόει τὸν θεόν.)
- Admonition(95b):* Let your light guide your deeds. (φῶς σου τῶν πράξεων προηγείσθω)
- Maxim (96):* The greatest impiety toward God is the mistreatment of a human being (μεγίστη ἀσέβεια εἰς θεὸν ἀνθρώπου κάκωσις).
- Maxim (97):* A soul is enlightened by reflection upon God. (ψυχὴ φωτίζεται ἐννοίᾳ θεοῦ)

The instructional body consists of four admonitions, followed by two theological maxims which serve to concretize the abstract commands given by the admonition-chain: the error (93) and bad action (94) are defined as mistreatment of another person, and the light (φῶς) which guides deeds (95b) is defined as the soul's enlightenment (φωτίζεται) by reflection upon God (97). The order of the explanatory maxims replicates the order of the admonitory body. The repetition of *πράττειν* cognates unites the four admonitions into one cluster. The two admonitions which form the center of the cluster (94, 95a) express the same thought, but antithetically and chiasmatically, with God doing the "thinking" in the first line, the person in the last line, and *not* doing the deed converted to doing the deed in the two center lines. Thus they form a mirror image:

ὃ πράττων οὐκ ἂν θέλοις εἰδέναι τὸν θεόν
τοῦτο μὴ πράξης
πρὸ παντὸς οὗ πράττεις
νόει τὸν θεόν.

These two center admonitions have a theological focus. The two flanking admonitions (93, 95b) however, have an anthropological focus and both state the same thought though in different words: contemplate before acting. The *σκέπτου* of 93 corresponds roughly with *φῶς...προηγείσθω* of 95b. The composition executes a linear elaboration as well: it opens with the general and universal admonition to think before acting (93). The next two units *specify* the ethical thinking demanded by the opening admonition as being reflection upon God's will. The opening admonition is repeated in the final admonition, but with reflection upon God picked up from 94-95a and stated metaphorically as "your light."

In case there is any ambiguity, this metaphor is then decoded in the final maxim (97). Likewise the two concluding maxims respectively pick up the two *Leitmotifs* of the cluster: deeds; contemplation of God.

Sextus 307-311 is also carefully composed:

- Maxim (307):* A wise man presents God to humanity (σοφὸς ἀνὴρ θεὸν ἀνθρώποις συνιστᾷ).
Maxim (308): Of all his works, God is most proud of a sage (ὁ θεὸς τῶν ἰδίων ἔργων μέγιστον φρονεῖ ἐπὶ σοφῷ).
Maxim (309): Next to God, nothing is as free as a wise man. (οὐδὲν οὕτως ἐλεύθερον μετὰ θεὸν ὥς σοφὸς ἀνὴρ.)
Maxim (310): Whatever God possesses belongs also to the sage. (ὅσα θεοῦ κτήματα, καὶ σοφοῦ.)
Maxim (311): A wise man shares in the kingdom of God. (κοινωνεῖ βασιλείας θεοῦ σοφὸς ἀνὴρ)

This is a balanced composition. Σοφὸς ἀνὴρ θεὸν opens the first line, closes the last line, and in both is subject of the verb. Σοφὸς ἀνὴρ also appears in the center (309). The author has signaled the correlation of 308 and 310 by dropping the σοφὸς ἀνὴρ of the framework and center units in favor of the mere σοφὸς and both times rendering it in an oblique case (dative, genitive). Τῶν ἰδίων ἔργων (308) and κτήματα (310) are synonyms; τῶν ἰδίων when used as a substantive (τὰ ἴδια) is actually a precise synonym of κτήματα. Despite the care with which these units are woven together, it is difficult to detect any sort of developing elaboration, other than 311 specifying the “kingdom of God” as what “belongs to the sage” (310). Rather, the cluster is descriptive, though the description itself carries admonitory and motivating force. Finally, line 309, the central member of the cluster, picks up and reverses the thought of 306, the final member of the preceding cluster (303-306, a cluster in which cohesion is created around πράττης...πράξεις...πράξεων...πράξαι): “No more than you can compel God can you compel a sage to do what he does not wish.” This displays a compositional technique by which juxtaposed clusters are interlocked, or coordinated, by the repetition of a motif from the first cluster in the second.

Undoubtedly a more thorough analysis of the *Sentences of Sextus* would turn up other complex compositions.¹⁴⁶ Nevertheless,

¹⁴⁶ Other possible compositions are 230-240, 278-282, and 54-57b.

most of its sayings still appear to stand in rather looser connection with their contexts. But while compositions like these may not be the rule, neither are they exception, and the editorial acumen of the authors of at least some Greek gnomologia may have to be estimated higher than has sometimes been the case.

Ad Demonicum

The instructions of the *Ad Demonicum* follow a loose paraenetic style. After a prologue describing a typical instructional situation (an elder undertaking to instruct a youth), the text is divided into a series of topical groupings of varying length. Those consisting of more than one admonition cohere by theme and keywords.¹⁴⁷ The basic unit of even the longer thematic groupings is that of the independent admonition frequently accompanied by one or two motive clauses formed from gnomic sayings or examples.¹⁴⁸ In longer clusters the concern is less to develop an elaboration building to a climax than to treat one paraenetic theme from several different perspectives. Frequently, however, the first admonition (sometimes in the form of a maxim, for example, 18a: "If you love knowledge, you will be a master of knowledge") serves as a heading which strikes the theme of the cluster. The thematic cohesiveness of associated admonitions varies from cluster to cluster. Several topical groupings are situational; that is, a brief description of a recurring social situation stands at the beginning, to which is appended a short chain of instructions on wise behavior appropriate for coping with that situation. For example, On Drinking Parties (32), runs as follows:

Situation: "If possible, avoid drinking parties altogether, but if ever occasion arises when you must be present...";

Admonition: "...rise and take your leave before you become intoxicated...";

Motive by Comparison: "...for when the mind is impaired by wine it is like chariots which have lost their drivers, for just as these plunge along in wild disorder when they miss the hands which

¹⁴⁷ Carl Wefelmeier, *Die Sentenzensammlung der Demonicea* (Athens: Rossolatos, 1962), 8-9, 68-69, 85-88.

¹⁴⁸ Wefelmeier, *Sentenzensammlung*, 65-69; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 248; Zeller, "Weisheitliche Grundschrift," 396.

should guide them, so the soul stumbles again and again when the intellect is impaired."

Rosenkranz has argued that present in *Ad Demonicum* is a form of composition consisting of short concatenations of repeated key words or their cognates, which, by overlapping with other chains, serve both to delineate and interlock compositional groupings.¹⁴⁹ Wefelmeier notes cases of an associative connection between the final sentence of one cluster and the first sentence of the next.¹⁵⁰ Rosenkranz uncovers one instructional speech (27b-28b, On Moderate Enjoyment of Goods) where key words recur in a mirrored manner across the halves of the compositional unit. The word *μετρίαν* appears in the opening line, *μετρίως* in the closing, while *ἀγάπα* is the first and last word of the unit, the repetition of both words forming an *inclusio*. Hardly coincidentally these words express the cardinal virtue promoted by the composition. The full clauses creating the *inclusio* run as follows:

(a) "Set not your heart on the excessive acquisition of goods, but on a moderate enjoyment of what you have...";

(a¹) "...cherish your possessions not in excess but in moderation."

Several other key motif words which appear in the first half of the unit reappear in the second: *κτῆσιν...κτῆσαιτο//κτῆματα...κτῆματα...κτᾶσθαι*; *πλοῦτον//πλοῦτον*; *ὑπαρχόντων...ὑπάρχουσιν//ὑπάρχουσιν*. Standing facing each other at the center of the unit are *ἵππον//ἵππεύειν*. This mirror-like distribution of key words signifying crucial motifs is, however, singular for *Ad Demonicum*. Rosenkranz conjectures that the author resorted to such an arrangement because this particular speech stands near the center of the text.¹⁵¹ Whatever the case may be, it is clear that even in a text like the *Ad Demonicum*, which follows a loose paraenetic style, attention is given to arrangement. The looseness of sequences and groupings reflects conventions of a particular paraenetic style rather than editorial ineptitude.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹ Bernhard Rosenkranz, "Die Struktur der Ps. Isokrateischen Demonica," *Em* 34 (1966) 95-129; van Groningen, *Composition*, 34-35, suggests a similar technique for Theognis, *Elegies*. See also Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1069, and Wefelmeier, *Sentenzensammlung*, 86-87.

¹⁵⁰ Wefelmeier, *Sentenzensammlung*, 87, noting 28b-29a and 29d-30a.

¹⁵¹ Rosenkranz, "Struktur," 103-104, 125-126.

¹⁵² The style is not unlike that of the pastoral epistles and the paraenetic

Golden Verses of Pythagoras

Scholars have noted that the text of the *Golden Verses* shows a high level of internal organization.¹⁵³ A good example of a tightly constructed unit is lines 1-4, which is structured around a chiasm formed by the repetitions of the key verbs τίμα...σέβου...σέβε...τίμα:

Admonition: Honor (τίμα) the immortal gods first, in the order appointed by custom

Admonition: and revere (σέβου) your oath.

Admonition: Pay reverence (σέβε) next to the noble heroes and the spirits of the dead by performing the prescribed rites.

Admonition: Honor (τίμα) your parents as well as their closest relatives.

Repetitions of key lexemes define the boundaries of the topical unit which deals with obligations in one's vertical relationships. Knowledge of the literary structure saves one from the error of dividing the unit after "heroes" and "spirits of the dead" on the basis of thematic considerations which would separate the divine (gods, heroes, spirits of the dead; lines 1-3) from the human (parents and closest relatives; line 4). Another compositional indicator is the pairing of objects of reverence into a series of categories: gods/oaths; heroes/daimones; parents/close relatives, which maps cosmic space and traces a cosmic hierarchy.¹⁵⁴

Lines 27-31 present a compact instructional cluster:

*Programmatic Admonition + Motive:*¹⁵⁵ Deliberate before the deed, lest foolish things result from it (27).

Gnome: It is typical of a worthless man indeed to do or to say senseless things (28).

Specifying Admonition: But bring that to completion which will not distress you afterwards (29).

*Specifying Admonitions:*¹⁵⁶ Do not do even one thing of what

sections of the Pauline letters. See Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1075-78, and Fiore, *Personal Example*, 46-47.

¹⁵³ Derron, *Sentences*, xxi-xxii; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 271-72.

¹⁵⁴ Thom, *Commentary*, 104; see also P. W. van der Horst, *Les Vers d'Or Pythagoriciens* (Leiden: Brill, 1932), 4-7; translations from Thom.

¹⁵⁵ Thom, *Commentary*, 155, overlooks the motive function of ὅπως μὴ μωρὰ πέλῃται.

¹⁵⁶ Thom, *Commentary*, 155, designates these "specifying admonitions" a "cri-

	you do not understand, but learn what is necessary (30), and thus you will lead a most enjoy- able life (31).
<i>Result, Promise Clause:</i>	

We might add to this analysis that the positive promise clause which concludes the instruction (“and thus you will lead a most enjoyable life”) responds to the negative result clause (“lest foolish things result from it”) attached to the opening admonition, and also to “which will not distress you afterwards” in line 29b.

The adjacent unit (lines 32-38) elaborates the cardinal virtue of “due measure” (μέτρον...μέτρον...μέτρον [33, 34, 38]), and, as Thom points out, displays a ring arrangement:

<i>A. Specific: Due Measure in the Body:</i>	You should not be careless about your physical health, but you should practice due measure (μέτρον) in drinking, eating, and physical exer- cises.
--	--

By due measure (μέτρον) I mean
that which will not distress you (32-
33).

<i>B. General: Due Measure in Life-Style:</i>	Become accustomed to have a pure way of life, not an enervated one, and guard against doing the kind of thing that incurs envy (φθόρος) (34-35).
---	--

<i>A' Specific: Due Measure in Money:</i>	Do not spend money at the wrong time like someone ignorant of what is good, nor be tight-fisted (36-37).
---	--

<i>Encapsulating Gnome:</i>	Due measure (μέτρον) is in every- thing the best (38).
-----------------------------	---

<i>Summation of both Instructions:</i>	Do that which will not harm you, and take thought before the deed (39). ¹⁵⁷
--	--

This speech consists largely of admonitions with one declarative

teria for action,” with the last two focusing upon “knowledge as a prerequisite for action.”

¹⁵⁷ Thom, *Commentary*, 159-60.

sentence, “By due measure I mean that which will not distress you,” and a cumulative, epitomizing maxim, “Due measure is in everything the best” (μέτρον δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστον).¹⁵⁸ The first half of the central unit (“Become accustomed to have a pure way of life”) recapitulates lines 32-33, and the second half (“Guard against doing the kind of thing that incurs envy”) attaches forward to lines 36-37.¹⁵⁹ Hence the unit functions *correlatively* by assuming a *retrospective* and *prospective* stance. A general concluding gnome ties the knot on the entire instruction.

These two instructions, lines 27-31 and 32-38, form the building-blocks of an encompassing instructional unit (lines 27-39), marked off by the inclusio formed by 27 and 39: “Deliberate before the deed” (Βουλευέου δὲ πρὸ ἔργου)....take thought before the deed” (λόγισαι δὲ πρὸ ἔργου), and knit together by the three-fold repetition of “that which will not distress/harm you” (29, 34, 39).¹⁶⁰ The final line (39) sums up the entire instruction, with the first half, “Do that which will not harm you,” referring to the second instruction on moderation as regards care for body and life, and the second half, “take thought before the deed,” referring back to the first instruction on deliberation before action. The encompassing unit moves from general considerations to specific application: the first instruction calls generally for deliberation before acting to avoid distress and to produce an enjoyable life; the second concretizes that “enjoyable life” as a pure one moderate in food, drink, and expenditure.¹⁶¹ The encapsulating gnome, “Due measure is in everything the best,” lays down the guiding principle for the deliberations mandated in both instructions.

¹⁵⁸ Thom notes, “The final γνώμη (GV 38b) is actually made up of out of two famous sayings, namely, μέτρον ἄριστον [passim] and καιρὸς δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστος [Hesiod Op. 694b = Theognis 401]. It summarizes everything said in GV 32-38, and encapsulates like no other the virtue of σωφροσύνη...” (*Commentary*, 162-63).

¹⁵⁹ van der Horst *Vers d’Or*, 21.

¹⁶⁰ See van der Horst, *Vers d’Or*, 21. In lines 29 and 34, the verb is ἀνιήσκει; in line 39 it is βλάπτει.

¹⁶¹ Thom, *Commentary*, 154.

*Hellenistic-Jewish Instructional Speeches**Pseudo-Phocylides*

The monostichic *Pseudo-Phocylides* was likely produced in Alexandria sometime between 30 B. C. and 40 A. D. In many respects it conforms to compositional and ideational conventions of Greek gnomic literature.¹⁶² The primitive compositional techniques which scholars have customarily seen operative in Greek gnomologia have also been imputed to *Ps.-Phoc.* Van der Horst characterizes the text as “enumerative and incoherent,” in accordance with the “loose arrangement” of gnomologia, and Küchler states that “die (manchmal) assoziative Sprunghaftigkeit scheint das einzige kompositorische Prinzip zu sein, welches PseuPhok durchhält.”¹⁶³ At most scholars concede the presence of some topical arrangement of sayings, catchword connections, and occasional coordination of imperative and indicative statements in admonition + motive relationships, either with γάρ, or more frequently by dint of juxtaposition.¹⁶⁴

Wilson and Thomas demonstrate that these judgments underestimate the sophistication of *Ps.-Phoc.* at both micro- and macro-compositional levels. Wilson states that the work “manifests evidence of a careful and sustained literary structure” which makes it better resemble a wisdom poem than a gnomologium.¹⁶⁵ He shows the presence of inclusio and complex ring-compositions

¹⁶² P. W. van der Horst, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, SVTP 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 77, 81-82; idem, “Pseudo-Phocylides Revisited,” *JSP* 3 (1988) 3-30, esp. 15; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 301.

¹⁶³ van der Horst, *Sentences*, 80; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 273; see also Maurice Gilbert, “Wisdom Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 283-324, esp. 315-16, and Wilson, *Mysteries*, 11-12.

¹⁶⁴ Van der Horst, *Sentences*, 106; idem, “Pseudo-Phocylides Revisited,” 16; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 271. Pascale Derron, *Sentences*, xxvi-xxvii, divides the text into sections divided according to wisdom topoi: περί πλούτου (42-47), περί φρονήσεως (48-50), περί φθόνου (70-75), περί σωφρονύσης (76-96), περί θανάτου καὶ ψυχῆς (97-115), περί τύχης (116-121), περί λόγου καὶ σοφίας (122-131), περί ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας (132-152), περί ἐργασίας (153-174), περί γάμου (175-206), περί παιδῶν καὶ γονέων (207-222), περί δεσποτῶν καὶ οἰκετῶν (223-227).

¹⁶⁵ Wilson, *Mysteries*, 181; see Berger, “Hellenistische Gattungen,” 1046, who notes that *Ps.-Phoc.* combines features of both genres.

which knit together extended elaborations. Thomas argues that the predominance in *Ps.-Phoc.* of the “weisheitlichen Kurzspruch” has blinded scholarship to the presence of complex compositional units in the text, in particular, of a recurrent instructional speech form (“Mahn-Lehr-Einheit”). Accordingly, he rejects the notion that the topical clusters took shape merely on principles of loose association and catchword.¹⁶⁶ This instructional speech form is characterized by an opening, programmatic admonition (“Einleitungsmahnung” or “Hauptmahnung”), which is followed by one or any combination of assertions, applications, admonitions, gnomic sayings, motive clauses, comparisons, and examples which ground, concretize, and motivate adherence to the programmatic admonition.¹⁶⁷ Often a sequence of highly specific, concrete admonitions will include or terminate with an encompassing imperative or maxim (“Überhöhende Mahnung”).¹⁶⁸ Frequently the programmatic admonition is illustrated “mit situationsbezogenen Konkretisierungen.”¹⁶⁹ Programmatic imperatives are often grounded with double or longer sequences of motive clauses or with a one-line motive clause followed by an example or a comparison. *Ps.-Phoc.* 199-204 articulates this pattern in a simple form:

- Programmatic Admonition* (199): Bring not into your house an evil, wealthy wife;
Motive (200): you will be a hireling to your wife all for a wretched dowry.
Comparison (201-204): We seek well-bred horses and ploughers of earth—strong-necked bulls—and of dogs the best of all. But foolishly we do not contend to marry a good woman; nor does a woman reject a wicked man if he’s wealthy.¹⁷⁰

Of interest also is the inclusio formed by the last line (204) and the first (199), mediated by synonymous or directly repeated key words (γυναῖκα κακὴν πολυχρήματον//γυνὴ κακὸν ἄνδρ’ ἄφνεόν) with an inversion: the “evil, wealthy wife” of the opening admo-

¹⁶⁶ Thomas, *Phokylides*, 32-33, 55-56, 123.

¹⁶⁷ Thomas, *Phokylides*, 111-23; see also 28-29, 32, 53, 55, 89, 111-12.

¹⁶⁸ Thomas, *Phokylides*, 129-30, citing lines 30, 59, 102, 121, 193.

¹⁶⁹ Thomas, *Phokylides*, 116-17, noting 153-57 and 207-209.

¹⁷⁰ Cited by Thomas, *Phokylides*, 118; also lines 70-75, 109-15, 122-31.

nition becomes the “wicked man” who is “wealthy” of the closing line.

Ps.-Phoc. 42-47 is an instructional speech in which the programmatic position is occupied by maxims instead of direct admonitions:

<i>General Maxim</i> (42):	The love of money is the mother of every evil.
<i>Supportive Maxim</i> (43):	Gold and silver are always a delusion for people.
<i>Illustrative Invective Apostrophe</i> (44-47):	Gold, you cause of evils, destroyer of life, crushing everything, would that you were not such a longed-for calamity to mortals! On your account there are fights and robberies and murders, and children are enemies to their parents, and brothers to their kinfolk.

The opening maxim functions as a general heading and lines 43-47 comment upon it.¹⁷¹ The apostrophe shifts to direct address, personifies money, and indicts it for its social crimes. It concretizes the opening maxim by listing the specific incarnations of the “evil” which received only general mention in the opening maxim.

Three longer speeches (lines 9-21; lines 22-30; lines 79-96) incorporate elements of complex ring arrangements, a mechanism apparently invoked to help manage the multiple constituent units of longer instructions. Wilson schematizes the first composition (lines 9-21), *On Striving for Justice*, as follows:

- A. *On Striving for Justice* (9): “Always dispense (νέμειν) just things (δίκαια) and prolong no decision to gain favor.
- B. *Against Oppressing the Poor* (10): “Do not unjustly oppress (μὴ θλίψῃς πενίην) a poor man; judge not by his countenance.”
- C. *God’s punishment of injustice* (11): “If you judge evilly, God will afterwards judge you.”
- D. *Against False Witness* (12): “Shun false testimony; decide what is right.”
- E. *An example of Fair Dealing: Guarding a Deposit* (13): “Safeguard a deposit, and protect your integrity in all circumstances.”

¹⁷¹ Wilson, *Mysteries*, 88; idem, *Love Without Pretence*, 49.

- F. General (gnomic) principle on just measures (14): "Dispense just measures (μέτρα νέμειν τὰ δίκαια); it is good to have a measure in all circumstances."
- E' An Example of Fair Dealing: Honest Balances (15): "Tip not a scale to one side, but weigh (both sides) equally."
- D' Against Perjury (16): "Do not commit perjury, either unknowingly or deliberately."
- C' God's Anger with Perjurers (17): "Immortal God detests anyone who swears falsely,"
- B' Against Oppressing the Poor (18-20): "Do not steal seeds; cursed is whoever takes them. Give to a worker his wage; oppress not (μὴ θλίβε πένητα) a poor man. Be mindful of your tongue; keep in your heart a word given in confidence."
- A' On Striving for Justice (21): "Be unwilling to do wrong (ἀδικεῖν), and therefore check a wrong-doer (ἀδικοῦντα)."

The repetition of δίκαια (line 9) and ἀδικεῖν, ἀδικοῦντα (line 21) marks out with an antithetical inclusio the boundaries of this unit, with the opening admonition to do justice and the closing admonition to hinder the one doing injustice carrying out a clever reversal. Δίκαια and cognates are distributed throughout the speech as *Leitwörter*. A and A', inversely related through antithetical formulation, establish thematic parameters and enclose specific concretizations of the general theme which they articulate. The central unit (F) contains an *epitomizing gnomic saying* which undergirds the specific injunctions with an appeal to common wisdom. As well it functions in a coordinating manner, for it repeats νέμειν τὰ δίκαια from the opening line while its reference to just measures anticipates the themes of the second half of the speech. The two "C" units (lines 11, 17) invoke *divine sanctions* to motivate obedience, and the "E" units (lines 13, 15) provide concrete examples of the just behavior which the composition as a whole recommends, though line 12, "shun false testimony," line 16, "do not commit perjury," and lines 18-20, "do not steal seeds...give to a worker his wage...be mindful of your tongue," likewise are concrete specifications of the framework admonitions.¹⁷² We see here how even a monostichic wisdom composi-

¹⁷² Wilson, *Mysteries*, 82; idem, *Love Without Pretence*, 75-77.

tion can create a complex yet integrated rhetorical elaboration, in this case, on rendering justice to the poor. The framework sections articulate the programmatic theme in positive and negative modes, an epitomizing gnomic saying appears in the center, while the intermediate positions concretize the programmatic demands and threaten deviance with divine judgments.

Though not treated in detail by Wilson, the adjacent instruction (lines 22-30, On Helping the Poor) is compositionally not unlike the speech in lines 9-21, though less reliant on ring arrangements.¹⁷³ It is the second constituent speech within *Pseudo-Phocylides*' encompassing opening section (lines 9-41), and its emphasis on helping the poor is the positive counterpoise to the first speech which forbids oppressing the poor. We can represent it as follows:

Programmatic Admonition to Almsgiving (22-23): To a beggar give (πτωχῷ δίδου) immediately, and do not tell him to come tomorrow. You are to fill your hand (χεῖρ'); give alms to one in need (χρήζοντι παράσχου).

Concretizing Admonitions (24-26): Receive a homeless person...guide a blind man. Pity a shipwrecked personTo one who falls give a hand (χεῖρα πεσόντι δίδου), and save an unprotected man.

Gnomic Sayings (27): Common to all is suffering (κοινὰ πάθη πάντων); life's (βίος) a wheel; unstable is happiness.

Admonitions to Sharing (28-29): Having wealth extend your hand (σὴν χεῖρα πενητεύουσιν ὀρεξον) to the poor. From what God has given you (ἔδωκε θεός) provide for those in need (χρήζουσι παράσχου).

Cumulative Admonition (30): Let all of life be in common (κοινὸς ἅπας ὁ βίος) and let all things have unity of purpose.

This speech is unified by a close weave of repeated *Leitwörter*, most obvious being the *χρήζουσι παράσχου* repeated in the first and second half of the composition (lines 23, 29), as well as *δίδου* (three times), *χεῖρα* (three times), *κοινά, κοινός, πάντων, ἅπας, πάντα, βίος* (two times). The first five lines are a series of asyndetic imperatives; line 27 then presents three gnomes. Lines 28-29 are unified by common reference to the addressee's wealth, the second identifying it as the gift of God which should be in

¹⁷³ Identified as a unified speech by Thomas, *Phocylides*, 118 ("Mahnungen zum Helfen").

like manner shared with the poor (ὧν σοι ἔδωκε θεός serving as a synonym to πλοῦτον ἔχων). The final, comprehensive admonition employs the third person singular imperative form.¹⁷⁴ These shifts in syntax, grammatical structure, and motif serve to mark off the sub-sections of the speech.

The opening two lines set forth the most general case of mercy—almsgiving to the poor (lines 22-23). The speech then moves quickly through a series of even more specific concretizing admonitions: the homeless, the blind, the shipwrecked, the downfallen, the unprotected—all of these specific cases are brought under the rubric of the almsgiving imperative. The opening admonition is itself quite specific; however, almsgiving is the overarching virtuous act with respect to the poor, an act which *Sir* 3:30 states has power of atonement (see also *Tobit* 4:7-11).¹⁷⁵ Ben Sira's section on mercy toward the poor likewise is inaugurated by an admonition to almsgiving, which like *Ps.-Phoc.* 22-23 is similarly followed by a series of specific concretizations: the hungry, the suppliant, orphans (*Sir* 4:1-10).

The three gnomic sayings in line 27 mark a coordinating transition in the speech: the reference to suffering summarizes retrospectively the various misfortunes tabulated in lines 22-26, while the keywords κοινά, πάντων, and βίος anticipate the elaboration of these concepts in the second half of the speech, in which commonality of suffering is turned into an argument for a certain degree of commonality of goods voluntarily redistributed to the poor.

Common to both speeches is a *central gnomic saying(s)* which articulates a piece of wisdom applicable to the specific virtue under deliberation. The intermediate units by means of concretizing admonitions and specific arguments show the opening admonition's range of application and motivate obedience it. Though not forming an inclusio, the opening of the second speech is programmatic and the closing expresses in a cumulative, comprehensive manner the moral principles animating the specific instructions which precede it. The admonitions of the first half

¹⁷⁴ Thomas, *Phokylides*, 118.

¹⁷⁵ On the programmatic status of almsgiving in Jewish ethics see Roman Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, JSNTSuppl 77 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 46-59; see also Betz, *Commentary*, 354-55.

of the speech (lines 22-26) set forth specific cases of compassionate giving; the admonitions of the second half in concert with the central gnomes (lines 27-30) justify this magnanimity towards the unfortunate: misfortune can fall upon all (line 27); give as God has given (lines 28-29); reflect on the common life of humanity (line 30).

The third specimen of extended speech composition is found in lines 79-96. The following is a modified version of Wilson's schematization:

Programmatic Admonition (76): Practice moderation, and refrain from evil deeds.

Opening Admonitions (79-80): Trust not quickly (μὴ πίστευε τάχιστα) before you truly see the end. To outdo one's benefactors with further benefactions is fitting.

Examples of Moderate Benefaction (81-85): It is better to entertain guests promptly with simple meals (λιταῖσι τραπέπαις), than with many festivities extending beyond due time. Never become a harsh creditor to a poor man. Let no one take all the birds from a nest at the same time, but leave behind the mother so that you may again have her young.

Example: Don't trust the ignorant (86): Never allow untrained [ignorant] men (ἄδαήμονας ἄνδρας) to judge.

Gnomic Comparison: the Sage (88): A wise man manages wisdom (τὴν σοφίην σοφὸς εὐθύνει), a fellow-craftsman, crafts.

Example: Don't trust the ignorant (89-90): An untaught ear (ἄδίδακτος ἀκοή) does not grasp a great teaching; for surely those who never learned good things do not comprehend (οὐ γὰρ δὴ νοέουσ' οἱ μηδέποτ' ἐσθλὰ μαθόντες).

Example of Immoderation and Misplaced Trust (91-94): Make not table-clearing (τραπεζοκόρους) companions your companions. For many are companions of eating and drinking, beguiling time whenever they can satisfy themselves, all being annoyed with little and insatiable with much.

Concluding Admonition and Gnome (95-96): Trust not the people (λαῶ μὴ πίστευε): the mob is shifty. For people and water and fire are ever uncontrollable.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁶ Compare Wilson *Love Without Pretence*, 118.

Wilson argues that this elaboration is a concretization of a “protreptic maxim” which expresses the “governing virtue” to “practice moderation” (line 76), and which is followed by a short series of antithetical maxims (lines 77-78) highlighting the ideal of justice over personal vengeance.¹⁷⁷ If one takes lines 76, 79-80 as programmatic, with due attention to the final gnomic saying (line 96), one can see that the cluster applies the cardinal virtue of moderation to issues of trust and benefaction. Benefaction is treated in the opening banquetting instructions and in the admonition to be magnanimous to the poor debtor (so the wretch can be milked indefinitely) while the issue of where to place one’s trust is discussed in the units treating the question “who is qualified to judge” and the closing units on false friendship. Of special note is the appearance of a gnomic saying (as in the preceding two examples) at the center of the composition, which compares the sapiential discipline of the sage with the work of a craftsman. The gnome creates an antithetical comparison with the adjoining material on the unreliability of the ignorant in giving judgment, but also sets forth the general ethos of the competent sage upon which both this cluster and the surrounding passages (going back to line 55, united by attention to σωφροσύνη) are predicated.¹⁷⁸

These three speeches show the compositional sophistication which the instructional speech is capable of displaying, though, of course, not all of the instructional clusters in *Ps.-Phoc.* replicate this pattern.

Syriac Menander

Syriac Menander is made up of serialized instructional speeches which elaborate specific themes by means of juxtaposed admonitions, motive clauses, and gnomic sayings, as the following extracts attest.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁷ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 116-117. The antithetical maxims (lines 77-78) are: “Do not imitate evil, but leave vengeance to justice./For while persuasion is an advantage, strife sows strife in turn.” The practice of justice is taken up in lines 86-90, which treat the topic of whom to trust with judgment.

¹⁷⁸ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 118.

¹⁷⁹ Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 309, characterizes *Syr. Men.* as loosely composed “Weisheitslehre.” Wilhelm Frankenberg, “Die Schrift des Menander (Land

Syr. Men. 52-58:

- Admonition:* Drink wine moderately, and do not boast of it;
Motive (deterrent example) for wine is, indeed, mild and sweet, but every man that quarrels and boasts of it will immediately be dishonored and despised.
- Admonition:* But when your thirst is quenched, depart, but not (so that what) is left (is) what the dogs eat, the vomit of the stomach.

This cluster is typical of the shorter instructions contained in *Syr. Men.*: an opening and closing admonition frame a motive clause; a final admonition recapitulates in different words the opening admonition. The bipartite opening admonition, with its positive and negative members, is also frequent, though sometimes replaced by two or three negative or positive admonitions.

Following hard upon this instruction is another on mastering the appetite (lines 59-66), and thus the concluding word of the first instruction, "stomach," acts as a catchword facilitating the transition to the next. Together the two parallel clusters form an encompassing instruction on drinking and eating.

- Admonitory Maxim* There are two hateful things, and in both of them the stomach is involved: starvation, (the stomach) is swollen, satiety, (the stomach) is at the bursting point.
- Motive (Deterrent Example)* And there is no one who follows his lust and his stomach who will not immediately be dishonored and despised.
- Motive (Macarism):* Blessed is the man who has mastered his stomach and his lust, he is one on whom one can rely at all times.

anecd. syr. I. S. 64ff.), ein Produkt der jüdischen Spruchweisheit," *ZW* 15 (1895) 226-77, esp. 229, 270, acknowledges the presence of topical groupings, but emphasizes the abrupt nature of the composition. Friedrich Schulthess, "Die Sprüche des Menander, aus dem syrischen übersetzt," *ZW* 32 (1912), 199-224, esp. 202, suggests that the Greek gnostic anthology is its closest relative. Jean-Paul Audet, "La sagesse de Ménandre l'Égyptien," *RB* 59 (1952) 55-81, esp. 56-57, argues that *Syr. Men.* presents a mixture of Jewish and pagan wisdom, and conjectures it may have been composed by a God-fearer. T. Baarda, introduction to *Sentences of the Syriac Menander* in *OTP* 2.583-90, esp. 583, labels it a "florilegium." *Syr. Men.* is difficult to date; internal evidence suggests the third century, A. D. (Baarda, 585). Translation by Baarda.

The closing macarism singles out for a blessing the person who conforms to the instruction. A maxim with admonitory force substitutes for a direct admonition in the opening position.

Syr. Men. 301-313 shows how instructions incorporate maxims and gnomes:

- Maxim:* Hateful is loquacity, and excessive laughter is a (true) disgrace.
- Admonition:* Disorderly conduct, despise it at all times.
Reject, hate the talkative person,
- Example:* who interrupts (others) but (who himself) speaks the more.
Though he had (even) ten thousand enemies,
they would not hurt him like his own tongue;
every day he is involved in a deadly fight,
he has not a bright face,
due to the wounds for which he is censured.
- Maxim:* There exists nothing better than silence.
- Maxim:* Being silent at all time is a virtue.
- Maxim:* Even if a fool is silent, he is counted wise.

The programmatic maxim finds immediate application in an admonition. An extended description of the unhappy life of the talkative person, which functions as a deterrent, forms the motive unit. Closure is effected by a chain of three maxims rather than a closing admonition. As usual, however, these closing maxims return to the opening maxim and admonition, though with a twist: the opening maxim condemns excessive talk and laughter; the closing maxims praise silence. This antithesis of condemnation and praise permits the instruction to suggest a praiseworthy behavior in place of the actions frowned upon.

Lines 76-93 illustrate the generic latitude which could be exercised by the instructional speech:

- Admonition:* Do not be quarrelsome;
do not stretch out your hand against one older than you.
- Chreia:* For the companions of Homer asked him,
"Whosoever will smite an old man,
what will happen to him?"
He said to them, "His eyes will be blinded."
"And whosoever will beat his mother,
what will happen to him?"

He said to them, "The earth shall not receive him,
 for she is the mother of all men."
 And again they asked him,
 "And whosoever will smite his father,
 what will happen to him?"
 Homer said to his companions,
 "This has not happened,
 And so it cannot be taken into account;
 for a son who beats his father does not exist,
 unless his mother bore him after committing adultery
 with a foreigner."

The instructional nature of the speech is established by the opening admonition; the bulk of the unit is taken up by a tripartite chreia, with Homer filling the role of sage. Three questions are put to Homer; the final answer is longest and also conclusive. The anecdote, which had separate circulation,¹⁸⁰ has been attached to the opening admonition to elaborate its meaning and provide a motive for obedience to it.

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

The instructional units of the *Test. 12. Pat.* have been likened to the synagogue homily. They display the following general pattern: (1) an opening programmatic statement which admonishes performance of a certain virtue or prohibits a certain vice, followed by (2) a course of argumentation, concluded by (3) an exhortation to embody the virtue or to avoid the vice. These paraenetic speeches vary in length and means of argumentation. The lengthy *T. Jos* 2:4-10:3 enunciates its programmatic virtue—perseverance and endurance ("In ten testings he showed that I was approved, and in all of them I persevered, because perseverance [ὑπομονή] is a powerful medicine and endurance [μακροθυμία] provides many good things")—in 2:4, upon which follows a long *didactic narrative* featuring Joseph as a paraenetic exemplar (chapters 3-9) and detailing his resistance to the blandishments of Potiphar's wife. The conclusion repeats the opening moral—

¹⁸⁰ Frankenberg, "Schrift des Menander," 238, notes that a similar story was reported of Solon, and that the final answer is found isolated in Herodotus, *Histories*, I, 137.

“So you see, my children, how great are the things that patience (ὑπομονή) and prayer with fasting accomplish” (10:1)—and offers an exhortation coupled with a promise—“You also, if you pursue self-control (σωφροσύνη) and purity (ἀγνεία) with patience (ὑπομονή) and prayer with fasting in humility of heart, the Lord will dwell among you, because he loves self-control” (10:2). This exhortation functions cumulatively, summing up the virtues of purity and self-control which emerged in the course of the exemplary narrative.¹⁸¹

Küchler draws attention to the unique structure of *T. Levi* 13:1-9, which we can represent as follows:

Admonition to Study the Torah: And now, my children (τέκνα μου), I command you: Fear the Lord with your whole heart, and walk in his Law with integrity. Teach your children letters also (διδάξατε δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν γράμματα), so that they might have understanding throughout all their lives, as they ceaselessly read the Law of God.

Motive—Advantages of the Torah-scholar: For everyone who knows the Law of God shall be honored wherever he goes, he shall not be a stranger. He shall acquire many more friends (φίλους) than his parents, and many men will want to serve him and to hear the Law from his mouth.

Admonitions/Maxims to Do Righteousness: Therefore, my sons (τέκνα μου), do righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) on earth in order that you might find it in heaven. Sow good things in your souls and you will find them in your lives. If you sow evil, you will reap every trouble and tribulation.

Admonition to Acquire Wisdom: Acquire wisdom (σοφίαν κτήσασθε) in fear of the Lord

Motive—Advantages of the Sage: because if a captivity occurs, if cities and territories are laid waste, if silver and gold and every possession are lost, nothing can take away the wisdom of the wise man, except the blindness of impiety and the obtuseness of sin. For if anyone preserves himself from these

¹⁸¹ John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 158, sees here a homiletic outline; see also Lawrence Wills, “The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity,” *HTR* 77 (1984) 277-99, and Hartwig Thyen, *Der Stil der jüdische-hellenistischen Homilie*, *FRLANT* 47/65 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955), 75.

evil deeds, his wisdom shall be glorious, even among his opponents; it will be found to be a homeland in a foreign territory, and a friend (φίλος) in the midst of his enemies.

Final Promise Clause: Whoever teaches these things and practices them (διδάσκη ταῦτα καὶ πράττει) shall be enthroned with kings, as was Joseph my brother.

Küchler points out that the instruction is centered around three admonitions: to teach “letters” and hence the Law; to do righteousness; to acquire wisdom.¹⁸² The twin descriptions of the advantages accruing to the *Torah scholar* and to the *sage* serve to motivate the first and last commands respectively, and three maxim-like sayings in the middle unit ground the command to “do righteousness.” The balanced descriptions of the *Torah scholar* and the *sage*, which motivate the first and last admonitions respectively, correspond to each other in an a b c//a’ b’ c’ pattern: (1) Fear the Lord...read the Law of God//acquire wisdom in the fear of the Lord; (2) the *Torah scholar* at home in his travels//the *sage* secure in exile; (3) the *Torah-scholar* becomes famous and acquires more friends (φίλους) than his parents//the *sage* becomes famous and finds wisdom a friend (φίλος) in the midst of enemies. The tight gnomic structure of the three statements clustered in the middle shows the porousness of the boundary between maxim and admonition. Their appearance in this central position can be taken as another occurrence of the “gnomic center” stylistic convention observed in *Ps.-Phoc.* Within it cross the spatial axes of *heaven-earth* and *inside-outside*. The composition coordinates *Torah* and *Wisdom* by placing the twin descriptions of the scholar and the sage in flanking positions around the center.¹⁸³ The center for its part profiles the central demand of the Law—to do righteousness. The opening admonition and the closing promise, both of which pragmatically admonish the reader to teach the Law, create a kind of framework around the whole. The final assertion of σύνθρονος ἔσται βασιλέων contains a hint of eschatological promise. Thus structure is seen to be an indispensable element in the enactment of rhetorical strategy. By virtue

¹⁸² Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 493. Küchler takes verse 6, “Sow good things in your souls,” as another admonition, but it reiterates the foregoing command to “do righteousness.”

¹⁸³ Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 494.

of its positioning of the various admonitions and their respective motivations relative to one another, the speech coordinates Torah with Wisdom, demonstrates that the pursuit of both is equivalent to fulfilling the Law's demand for righteousness, and with the final promise coordinates the present with the future.

Sirach

Sirach is replete with compositions of various lengths. Di Lella notes that often a single proverb programmatically introduces a series of other proverbs which elaborate the initial theme, and Baumgartner points to several cases in which instructional speeches are brought to closure by "eine allgemeine oder zusammenfassende Maxime."¹⁸⁴ Zeller provides an overview of the multi-formity of Sirach's instructional clusters. Sometimes a cluster begins with a "call to heed" plus an admonition in a manner reminiscent of Prov 1-9. At times a general admonition programmatically initiates a cluster, at other times a proverb or maxim, which is then exploited for instructional purposes by appended admonitions. Admonitions are frequently accompanied by motive clauses, even if such only follow upon a concatenation of admonitions. Sayings can be grouped to form descriptions, for example, of a friend (6:8-12, 14-17).¹⁸⁵

Sir 15:11-20 is a carefully composed instructional cluster:¹⁸⁶

Admonitions and Reasons: Say not, 'It was God's doing that I fell away'; for what he hates, he does not do (11). Say not, 'It was he who set me astray'; for he has no need of the wicked (12).

Theologically-focused Maxims: Abominable wickedness the Lord hates; he does not let it befall those who fear him (13). It was

¹⁸⁴ Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, trans. Patrick W. Skehan, introduction and commentary by Alexander A. Di Lella, AB 39 (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 24-25, noting 2:1-6; 16:1-4; 28:12-16 as candidates for this type of composition; W. Baumgartner, "Die literarischen Gattungen in der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach," *ZAW* 34 (1914) 161-98, esp. 165, citing 7:36; 13:1, 13; 17:3; 18:14, 27; 19:20, 28; 35:15; 38:15.

¹⁸⁵ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 38-39. Examples Zeller gives of opening thematic admonitions are 3:1f; 7:1-3; 10:6; 11:29; 12:1; 18:1; 10:28, of maxim + admonition 1:25; 3:30f; 6:5; 12:8f; 19:4-6; 22:19f; 23:8; 27:11, 16, 30; 42:9f, and of related admonitions followed by a motive statement 4:1-5, 7-10, 25-28; 5:9-12; 19:13f; 29:8-12; 32:10-12; 38:16f.

¹⁸⁶ Following Di Lella's (Skehan's) translation.

he, from the first, when he created humankind, who made them subject to their own free choice (14).

Human-focused Maxims: If you choose, you can keep his commandment; fidelity is the doing of his will (15). There are poured out before you fire and water; to whichever you choose you can stretch forth your hands (16). Before each person are life and death; whichever he chooses shall be given him (17).

Theologically-focused Maxims: Copious is the wisdom of the Lord; he is mighty in act, and all-seeing (18). The eyes of God behold his handiwork; he perceives a person's every deed (19).

Conclusion: No one did he command to sin, nor will he be lenient with liars (20).

In a short paraphrase the conclusion repeats the substance of the opening admonitions, labeling those who make such statements as are found in the opening admonitions "liars" and threatening a divine sanction. The two opening admonitions set forth the moral problem which the cluster will explore: God's sovereignty versus human moral freedom. The tightly bound double assertion-and-response of the opening admonitions is unpacked in the elaboration which follows. Two theological maxims refute the opening statements attributing evil actions to God and argue that human freedom and responsibility are rooted in God's choice. These are matched by two more theological maxims placed in the other half of the composition which set forth God as the omnipotent observer of human actions. "He first created humankind who made them subject to their own free choice" (verse 14), is answered by: "The eyes of God behold his handiwork; he perceives a person's every deed" (verse 19). Naturally, κύριος and its pronouns dominate these verses. These theological sections flank the central section which, with three maxims, argues for human moral freedom and urges the choosing of God's will. Thus the admonitory heart of this composition is found at its center. Because of its potential applicability to a range of deliberative issues the middle saying (verse 16) is the most gnomic of the three. It is flanked by two sayings (verses 15, 17) which draw out the meaning of its "fire and water" for this context. Appropriately, the center section is characterized by a piling-up of

“choice” verbs: θέλῃς...εὐδοκίας...θέλεις...εὐδοκήσῃ.¹⁸⁷ The effect of flanking these central statements on human moral freedom by theological maxims is to place that freedom under God’s moral purview, which indeed verses 18-19 make explicit. Thus the structure executes a linear elaboration: the two threshold assertions are grounded in two theological premises setting forth the righteousness of God and his endowment of humans with moral freedom. This prepares the way for the central demand that humans exercise that freedom by choosing obedience to God’s will. Following the vivid gnomic presentation of the two choices open to human beings, two more theological maxims depict God as the all-seeing assessor of human actions. The final unit adds the element of divine sanction by its allusion to God’s judgment while at the same time effecting closure by returning to the speech’s starting point. Thus the structure works out an abstract philosophical problem while simultaneously urging the readers (or auditors), under the motivating threat of divine sanction, to make righteous choices.

In *Sir* 27:30-28:7 we find maxims placed in the opening position:

Maxim: Anger and wrath, these also are abominations, yet a sinner holds on to them (27:30).

Maxim: The vengeful will face the Lord’s vengeance, for he keeps a strict account of their sins (28:1).

Programmatic Admonition: Forgive your neighbor’s injustice;

Motive: then when you pray, your own sins will be forgiven (28:2).

Rhetorical Question: Should a person nourish anger against another and expect healing from the Lord (28:3)?

Rhetorical Question: Should a person refuse mercy to another, yet seek pardon for his own sins (28:4)?

Rhetorical Question: If one who is but flesh cherishes wrath, who will forgive his sins (28:5)?

Closing Admonitions: Remember your last days, set enmity aside; remember death and decay, and cease from sin! Think of the commandments, hate not your neighbor; remember the covenant of the Most High, and overlook faults (28:6-7).

¹⁸⁷ Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 272, Hebrew *hps*. For a discussion of the relationship of the Greek text to Sirach’s Hebrew original see Benjamin G. Wright, *No Small Difference: Sirach’s Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text*, SBLSCS Series 26 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 231-234, 249.

The closing and opening admonitions form an *inclusio* through the repetition of ἄφεξ ἀδίκημα τῷ πλησίον σου / μὴ μηνίασης τῷ πλησίον, with the final admonition repeating the theme of the opening admonition antithetically (“forgive your neighbor....do not be angry at your neighbor”). The μηνίασης of the final admonition does double duty by forming an *inclusio* with the first word of the opening maxim: Μῆνις. The second maxim comments on the first in as much as it threatens with a severe divine sanction the vengeful person described in the first maxim. The individual assertions of both opening maxims are then transferred *in toto* to an opening programmatic admonition, though antithetically: the hearer is instructed to forgive the neighbor (in contrast to the angry sinner of Maxim One), and promised the Lord’s forgiveness of his own sins in return (in contrast to the divine vengeance promised in Maxim Two). This opening admonition and a chain of closing admonitions form a framework around a set of three *a minore ad maius* arguments couched as rhetorical questions. The final admonitions make a series of appeals based upon the prospect of approaching death, and then repeat the programmatic admonition to forgive the neighbor.

Sir 39:13-35 has been analyzed by Wolfgang Roth.¹⁸⁸ The following is a schematic representation of Roth’s analysis:

Call to Praise (13-15): Listen to me, my faithful children....sing a hymn of praise; bless the Lord for all his works. Ascribe majesty to his name and give thanks to him with praise, with songs on your lips, and with harps....

Thesis (16): All the works of the Lord are very good, and whatever he commands will be done at the appointed time.

Arguments from Creator’s Purpose (17-24): No one can say, ‘What is this?’ or ‘Why is that?’—for at the appointed time all

¹⁸⁸ Wolfgang Roth, “On the Gnostic-Disursive Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach,” in *Gnostic Wisdom = Semeia 17*, ed. John Dominic Crossan (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980), 59-79, esp. 66-68. Leo G. Perdue, *Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literatures of Israel and the Ancient Near East*, SBLDS 30 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 205-208, produces a compositional analysis which coheres with Roth’s on most points except on the division of the arguments which form the main body. Roth’s more economical analysis (which eliminates Perdue’s unwieldy “explanatory expansions” and achieves a rough balance of hemistichs between the two sections) is to be preferred in this case.

such questions will be answered. At his word the waters stood in a heap....When he commands, his every purpose is fulfilled, and none can limit his saving power. The works of all are before him, and nothing can be hidden from his eyes. From beginning to end of time he can see everything, and nothing is too marvelous for him.

No one can say, 'What is this?' or 'Why is that?'—for everything has been created for its own purpose....To the faithful his ways are straight, but full of pitfalls for the wicked.

Maxim (25): From the beginning good things were created for the good, but for sinners good things and bad.

Arguments from Creation (26-31): The basic necessities of human life are water and fire and iron and salt and wheat flour and milk and the blood of the grape and oil and clothing. All these are good for the godly, but for sinners they turn into evils.

There are winds created for vengeance...on the day of reckoning they will pour out their strength and calm the anger of their Maker. Fire and hail and famine and pestilence, all these have been created for vengeance; the fangs of wild animals...and the sword that punishes the ungodly with destruction. They take delight in doing his bidding, always ready for his service on earth; and when their time comes they never disobey his command.

Thesis (32-34): So from the beginning I have been convinced of all this and have thought it out and left it in writing: All the works of the Lord are good, and he will supply every need in its time. No one can say, "This is not as good as that," for everything proves good in its appointed time.

Call to Praise (35): So now sing praise with all your heart and voice, and bless the name of the Lord.

In this composition the sage works out a theodicy in response to questions raised by the presence of evil and the survival of the wicked and also appears to be refuting the pagan view that the gods, or fate, without moral distinction mix good and bad for all humans. The framework of praise strikes this theme, urging that the Lord be blessed for "all his works" (verse 14b). Verses 16 and 34, which form an inner framework, assert as a thesis the theme that everything God does is good, and that

human perplexity with regard to the justice of God will abate as God's purposes become apparent in the course of time. "Time" or "appointed time" or their semantic equivalents in fact function as *Leitwörter* (vv. 16, 17, 20, 28, 31, 33, 34).¹⁸⁹ Two courses of argument constitute the main body of the instruction, both of which appeal to creation. The first (verses 17-24) argues from the power of the divine creative word that there is no limit on God's power, nothing escapes his encompassing sovereignty, and nothing prevents him from fulfilling his purposes, in particular blessing for the righteous and wrath for the wicked—perhaps a counterblast to the doctrine of Fate. The second course of argument (verses 26-31) asserts that the goods in creation are blessings for the godly, and even though the wicked may enjoy them as well, "for sinners they turn into evils" (verse 27b). Moreover, apparent evils in creation, such as natural catastrophes, famines, vicious animals, and wars, are actually God's good servants which in time will wreak his wrath on the wicked.¹⁹⁰ Verse 25, located at the heart of the composition, makes no reference to direct divine agency, as do the heavily theological verses which precede it, but shifts to the divine passive. Thus it takes on gnomic qualities. As a gnome it constitutes a tightly bound, self-contained retort to the Greek commonplace that the gods (or Fate) mix good and evil for all humans without moral distinction. It is best described as a maxim, perhaps coined by Sirach for the occasion, which simultaneously *epitomizes* the instruction and acts as a pivot between the two main courses of argumentation which flank it.¹⁹¹ Retrospectively, it refers back to the act of creation described in verses 17b-21 (especially verses 20-21)¹⁹² and to the moral distinction between the good and the wicked which guides the working out of the Creator's purposes (verses 22-24). Prospectively, "good things for the good" and "good and bad things for the wicked" virtually articulate the thesis for the second course of argumentation (verses 26-31).

¹⁸⁹ Perdue, *Cult*, 207-208.

¹⁹⁰ Perdue, *Cult*, 207-208, suggesting that Sirach is targeting Qoheleth's scepticism.

¹⁹¹ Roth, "Wisdom," 68.

¹⁹² Both the Greek and Hebrew text employ synonyms rather than word for word repetition: ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (20)/ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς; (25a); *me'olam we 'ad 'olam* / *mer'os*.

Results

An ancient instructional speech genre, defined by a recurrent set of conventions, persisted through a long *Gattungsgeschichte* and across a highly differentiated range of performances. The signals of the genre are as follows: (1) the *programmatic admonition*, positive, prohibitive, or both, which inaugurates the speech and strikes its programmatic theme; (2) a more or less extended *course of argumentation* which seeks to persuade of the wisdom (reasonableness) of the programmatic admonition and, accordingly, motivate obedience to it, using gnomic sayings, additional or reiterative admonitions, maxims, rhetorical questions, comparisons, examples, promises of present or future beatitude of various sorts, and any combination of these and other small wisdom forms.¹⁹³ Highly recurrent elements of the genre are: (3) the *programmatic maxim* which by virtue of its implicit imperative force sometimes appears in place of or in combination with the programmatic admonition; (4) the implicit or explicit *threat of divine sanction*. Such threats of retributive divine sanction—along with their counterparts, the blessing and promise—cohere naturally with the basic “deed-consequence” structure of much sapiential reasoning which draws out the inevitable consequences of various behaviors within a divinely sustained cosmic order and which argues “*apotreptisch* und *protreptisch*.”¹⁹⁴ In view of this it is possible to see how prophetic forms such as announcements of judgment and woes might be incorporated within and exploited by the instructional speech, which by virtue of the dominant structural positions given the admonitory wisdom forms would act as a framework genre and in varying degrees adapt the prophetic form to its sapiential idiom.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹³ See also Mullins, “Topos,” 542, 546-47, who comes up with a quite similar description.

¹⁹⁴ Thomas, *Phokylides*, 112, 122; see also Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 140, Schmidt, *Adressat*, 96-98, West, *Works and Days*, 1, 6-7, 38-39, 47, Perdue, *Cult*, 86, 137, Verdenius, “Aufbau,” 134, Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs*, 17, and Hellmut Brunner, *Altägyptische Erziehung* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1957), 62.

¹⁹⁵ See Gese, “Weisheitsdichtung,” 1579, referring to the “Streitgespräch mit anschließendem göttlichem Urteilsspruch” in Sumerian wisdom literature, Schmidt, *Adressat*, 100, 104, 108-109, noting in Hesiod’s *Works and Days* the sharp threats of “Strafen und Vergeltung des Zeus” (108) directed towards the city that maltreats and rejects Dike, Thomas, *Phokylides*, 52, and Kayatz, *Studien*, 57. Egbert

Some compositional features which were frequently observed appear to be *stylistic* conventions and hence applicable at the discretion of the composer/editor. The most pervasive of these is the practice of *repeating the programmatic admonition or maxim at the conclusion of the speech*, with or without a motive clause(s) (the latter, when it appears, not infrequently a promise clause), thus forming an *inclusio*. The repetition can be either verbatim or in synonymous expressions and can use the same or a different wisdom form. Frequently the closing member plays on the opening through inversions, antitheses, or reversals of various kinds. Another stylistic convention is the *gnomic center*, consisting of a gnomic saying, or short chain of such sayings, at times in admonitory form, which encapsulates the arguments of the speech and may act as a coordinating pivot between sections. However, epitomizing gnomic sayings can also be found in *concluding* positions (as in the *Golden Verses*). The fact that we observed the “gnomic center” primarily in *Ps.-Phoc.*, *Test. 12 Pat.*, and *Sirach* (and as we shall see in chapter four, in *Wisdom of Solomon*) suggests that it is a stylistic convention particularly germane to Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom compositions. To be sure, there is a sense in which the entire instructional speech is gnomic, and gnomic sayings indeed appear throughout such speeches—converted to admonitions, subordinated within motive clauses, as rhetorical questions, and separately in virtually any position. It was possible to distinguish, however, gnomic sayings with an encapsulating, epitomizing weight with respect to the deliberative concerns of the entire cluster, and which were at times further distinguished by their placement in coordinating positions within the cluster or in a cumulative manner at its conclusion.¹⁹⁶

W. Seng, “Der reiche Tor: Eine Untersuchung von Lk xii 16-21 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung form- und motivgeschichtlicher Aspekte,” *NovT* 20 (1978) 136-55, esp. 139, notes that Luke 12:16-21, the parable of the Rich Fool, is a wisdom *Beispielerszählung*, but that verse 20, though an integral part of the unit, is an announcement of judgment, “der der Form prophetischer Gerichtsworte an Einzelpersonen im AT entspricht,” with the accusation “Fool” (a wisdom epithet) forming the *Anklage*, followed by the *Unheilsankündigung*.

¹⁹⁶ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 94-95, has noticed something similar to the “gnomic-center” convention, which he sees reoccurring regularly in larger compositions following this sequence: (1) a protreptic maxim; (2) elaboration of the ethical significance of the maxim; (3) central statement of “a relatively crucial goal or motivation of [the] ethical program...sometimes expressed in the form

Instructional speeches are obviously the products of scribes, who, drawing from a fairly small inventory of conventional techniques, put together speeches with persuasive power and not infrequently intricate arrangement. It is unlikely any of the compositions analyzed in this survey grew to full flower through gradual aggregation of single units (though nothing protects them from subsequent interpolation); rather, they are the result of deliberate compositional and rhetorical initiatives.

Our task now is to examine features of Q's instructional speeches in light of the of the ancient instructional speech genre and its inventory of compositional conventions.

of a maxim....[which] may represent the literary or rhetorical culmination of the exhortation that precedes; it may also serve as a turning-point in the section's argument, governing the direction of the material that follows....[and] may express a religious presupposition or self-evident truth for the audience that undergirds the message of the entire section"; (4) more concrete injunctions; and (5) striking maxim which concludes and summarizes the passage, often forming an *inclusio* with the opening.

CHAPTER THREE

INSTRUCTIONAL SPEECH GENRE IN Q

In this chapter we shall analyze the shorter instructional speeches in Q in the light of the results obtained in chapter two. We shall show that Q's sayings clusters are exemplars of the instructional speech genre.

Q's instructional speeches are as follows: Love Your Enemies (6:27-36); Judge Not (6:37-42); Trees, Fruit, and Speech (6:43-45); Confident Prayer (11:2-13, including 11:5-8); Beelzebul Controversy (11:14-23); Request for a Sign (11:29-35); Courageous Witness (12:2-12); Do Not Be Anxious (12:22-31, 33-34); Be Watchful and Ready (12:35-46); Discerning the Times (12:49-59); Enter the Narrow Gate (13:24-30; 14:11, 16-24, 26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35); Discerning the Day of the Son of Man (17:23-37). Substantial sections of Q are not part of the analysis in this chapter, namely, John's Sermon (3:7-9, 16-17), the Baptism (3:21-22), the Temptation (4:1-13), Beatitudes and Builders (6:20b-23, 46-49), the Healing of the Centurion's Child (7:1-10), John and Jesus (7:18-35), the Mission Instruction (9:57-60, 10:2-16, 21-22), the Blessing for Revelation (10:23-24), the Return of the Unclean Spirit (11:24-26), the Woes and Announcements of Judgment (11:39-48, 52, 49-51; 13:34-35), parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven (13:18-21), parables of the Lost Sheep and Lost Coin (15:4-10), Paraenesis and Law (16:13, 16-18; 17:1-6), parable of the Talents (19:12-26), and Thrones and Judgment (22:28-30). These units, with the exception of elements of the Mission Instruction, do not conform to the instructional speech genre which is the concern of this chapter; hence analysis of these passages is deferred to the next chapter.

The text followed is the International Q Project's reconstruction (with most sigla omitted), now being published as *Documenta Q*.¹ For the most part, the genre arguments adduced here cohere

¹ Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson, eds., *Documenta Q* (Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming).

with the text and order proposed by the IQP, and where agreement exists that text will be followed without comment.² Reconstruction arguments will be adduced in the rare cases of disagreement with the IQP text.

Instructional Speeches in Q

Love Your Enemies (6:27-35)

Schulz, Hoffmann, Kosch, and Lührmann utilize thematic-coherency criteria to produce redaction histories of this cluster. Schulz views the passage as the end result of a process of growth; his unfolding of this process relies upon discovery of supposed thematic dissonance among units, which in turn becomes an indicator of interpolation. Schulz decides that Matthew best preserves the Q sequence because the Matthean sequence of 6:27 + 35cd + 32-33 + 36 is a sensible one, with verse 35cd providing a motive to verse 27. This is a somewhat conflicted account, however, because Schulz attaches verses 32-33 ("ursprünglich") to verses 27, 35cd because of their thematic affinities, but later asserts that verses 32-33 are an insertion because they interrupt a thematic connection between verses 35cd and 36. (Hoffmann takes the very repetition created by verses 35, 36 as a problem; see below.) Schulz tries to avoid this conflict by asserting that verses 32-33 were "bald danach" added to the primitive cluster: 6:27, 35cd (as motive), 36. Verse 31 ("Golden Rule") may likewise be a later insertion since it breaks the connection of verses 27, 32-33, or it could be part of another cluster on retaliation (verses 29-31, as Matthew has it) which Luke has inserted after verse 27.³

² Though I had by and large worked out the following results before I encountered the work of the IQP, it was gratifying to discover that they corroborated IQP decisions reached largely by assessing "Matthean or Lukan redaction" arguments. Conversely, genre and compositional considerations drive my few areas of disagreement with the IQP's text. The editors acknowledge that IQP votes and results are provisional ("...should never be considered as completed or final..") [James M. Robinson, "The Sayings of Jesus: Q," *Drew Gateway* 54 (1983) 26-37, esp. 36].

³ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 120-23, 130-32.

Hoffmann reconstructs a Q sequence which corresponds to neither Matthew nor Luke: 6:27-28, 35cd (promise as motive), 32-33, 29-31, 36.⁴ His view of the Q composition depends upon the assumption that Luke has transposed units (verses 32-33 after verse 31) in line with his redactional interest in critiquing the rather bourgeois reciprocity ethic of his wealthier community, thus intentionally creating an unbearable tension between the mild ethic of the "Golden Rule" and the radical ethic of verses 32-33. Luke resolves this tension by his redactional advocacy of "doing good." Verse 35 was part of this transposition because the repetition of "father" in 6:35, 36 is, according to Hoffmann, clumsy and thus secondary. Despite the importance of these observations, it is not at all clear why this tension could not have existed in Q, nor is it clear what justifies imagining a non-conflicted Q position for 6:31 after 6:30 and before 6:36, especially since the allegedly thematically dissonant 6:31 and 33-35 would still be part of the same cluster, and therefore still standing in a tension not necessarily diminished by the proposed distance originally separating them. Hoffmann seems to assume that tensions are indicators of secondary interventions and so rearranges the present disposition of units in search of a less conflicted primitive text, while acknowledging, however, that 6:31 is still dissonant with the radical sayings 6:27, 29. Thus Hoffmann's reshuffling of the text only relocates the perceived dissonances. His solution—that in Q perhaps these sayings were in "eigenständige" positions, and that 6:30 is a "Neuansatz" initiating a thematically harmonious sequence 6:30, 31, 36, set off from the equally coherent 6:27, 35cd, 32-33, 29 (though here one could argue that verse 29 follows better upon the "enemies" reference of verse 27)—does not account for the form-critical unity of verses 29-30. A hypothetical Q sequence attested by neither of the double tradition texts and derived, moreover, from judgments about thematic coherence and incoherence, though a possible scenario, is problematic without some additional control.

Kosch argues for a primitive cluster consisting of 6:27(a)b, 28b,

⁴ Paul Hoffmann, "Tradition und Situation. Zur 'Verbindlichkeit' des Gebots der Feindesliebe in der synoptischen Überlieferung und in der gegenwärtigen Friedensdiskussion," in *Ethik im Neuen Testament*, ed. Karl Kertelge (Freiburg: Herder, 1984), 50-118, esp. 62, 68, 70-73.

29, 35efg, expanded later by verses 30, 31, 32-33, 36. He does not rely on compositional considerations, other than attaching 6:32-33 to 6:27, 35cd on the basis of the *Begründung* function indicated by γάρ and the catchword connection “love,” but “erst recht der sachliche Zusammenhang....” Rather, to support this redaction history Kosch resorts to a criterion of radicality: the earliest sayings present the most radical ethic; later additions evince a drift back towards conventional Jewish ethics.⁵ Lührmann likewise argues that verses 32-33 are a primitive yet secondary addition to verse 27a, since they de-radicalize the latter by referring to others as “sinners.” He produces an incremental redaction history: the primitive kernel is 6:27a, 35c, to which were added verses 32-33. Afterwards verse 27b was added when 6:22-23 were added to 6:20-21 (beatitudes). This solves the problem of 6:32-33 following poorly after 6:27b, which deals with abuse, not reciprocity. Yet even here we are only at the “älteste Schicht”, which is followed by the addition of verses 29-30 and then verse 31, the latter, however, being difficult to place in the tradition-history of the cluster.⁶

Though each of these analyses, taken on its own terms, is plausible and incorporates important exegetical observations, the redactional histories they propose are hard to reconcile, demonstrating that without recourse to compositional criteria which might act as an additional control, redaction-history configurations of 6:27-35 enabled by thematic-coherence analysis tend to proliferate.

Some scholars inject literary-critical criteria into the determination of the cluster’s formation while remaining within the context of “growth” accounts. Schürmann defines the primitive cluster as consisting of 6:27, 32-33, 35ac, into which were interpolated

⁵ Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 306, 322-24. Michael G. Steinhauser, “The Violence of Occupation: Matthew 5:40-41 and Q,” *TJT* 8 (1992) 28-37, esp. 35, likewise invokes “radicality” as a means of recovering a primitive layer, characterized by a “radical Cynic reaction to...military occupation” (Matt 5:41; Luke 6:29), arguing that verse 30 attempts “to moderate the radical statements of the previous three sayings.” Analyses such as these fail to grasp the anthropological insight that *retaliation and reciprocity are interrelated concepts*; hence the shift from discussion of retaliation to discussion of reciprocity is no evidence of a redaction-history shift away from “radicality”.

⁶ Lührmann, “Liebet,” 425-27.

verses 29-31 and 35b.⁷ In this he is followed by Kloppenborg, who supplies some genre-critical justification: four general admonitions in verses 27-28 initiate the cluster, verses 32-33 supply the expected motive clauses closely correlated with the first two admonitions ("love, do good"), verse 35 recapitulates the opening admonition, and verse 35e provides a culminating motive clause. The designation of verses 29-31 as later insertions, however, rests in part on the questionable assumption that repeated key words are "catchwords" indicating primitive contiguous juxtaposition, that is, that the "love...do good" admonitions of verses 27-28 are answered by "love...do good" of verses 32-33. This leads naturally to the view that verses 29-31 interrupt this catchword connection and are thus intrusive.⁸ In the previous chapter, however, we saw numerous cases in which original, cohesive compositions were knit together by non-contiguous key words. "Catchword" is a question-begging label; more appropriate is "key word recurrence", a description which leaves open from case to case the question of whether this phenomenon actually preserves residual traces of a now-lost catchword function at some putative earlier stage of the composition. Moreover, while verses 32-33 are indeed motives to the opening admonition, in a real sense all elements of an ancient instructional speech have motive force, and "for" clauses can appear virtually anywhere in the course of a speech. Aristotle allowed enthymemic structures to appear more than once in the course of a speech so long as they were balanced by examples; thus 6:31-33 might itself be taken as an enthymeme: maxim plus motive clauses. Vaage is

⁷ Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HTKNT 3, 2 vols. (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder & Herder, 1969, 1994), 1.346, 357.

⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 177. See also David R. Catchpole, "The Law and the Prophets," 98-99, and Piper, *Wisdom*, 79-80. Both argue for the presence of a primitive compositional pattern, interpolated by verses 29-31 (in the case of Piper, verses 29-30, 35a). For Catchpole it consists of an opening admonition, followed by two illustrative arguments (verses 32-33), concluded by a summary restatement of the demand with a promise. For Piper it is as follows: general maxims (6:27, 31) + specifying maxim (6:35cd) + two rhetorical questions (6:32-33) + direct application (6:36). Though both appeal to recurrence of the structure elsewhere in Q, the attestational basis is restricted, and hence its application in difficult cases like 6:27-35 becomes self-confirming—material such as verses 29-30 which would clog up the pattern is eliminated as intrusive.

thus justified in his rejoinder that nothing prevents verses 29-31 being an original component of the elaboration, and that verses 32-33 may well pick up on the reciprocity theme sounded by verse 31 rather than inevitably, through "catchwords", pointing back to the opening admonitions.⁹ Moreover, Lührmann points out that verses 32-33 do not work well placed after verse 27 because of weak thematic correspondence.¹⁰ By contrast, verse 29 functions superbly as an elaboration of the persecution and abuse topic sounded in verse 27.

However, Kloppenborg's appeal to generic regularities of instructional speeches is a promising approach to resolving issues surrounding the composition of this cluster. In the previous chapter we saw that divine promise clauses, or promise clauses in general, frequently appear at or towards the end of an instructional speech. Q 6:27-35, ending as it does with a promise clause, is consistent with this form-critical pattern. The example adduced by Kloppenborg, "Be a father to orphans, and be like a husband to their mother; you will then be like a son of the Most High, and he will love you more than does your mother" (*Sir* 4:10), likewise concludes a short instructional cluster consisting of a chain of admonitions on helping the poor (*Sir* 3:30-4:10). *Sir* 4:25-28, an instruction on "speaking the truth," concludes with the promise, "Fight to the death for truth, and the Lord God will fight for you." *Sir* 32:10-13, a sayings cluster on modest behavior, begins with a maxim in 32:10: "Lightning travels ahead of the thunder, and approval goes before one who is modest," followed by four admonitions, and is concluded by an admonition and promise: "But above all bless your maker, who fills you with his good gifts." Concluding the Love Your Enemies speech with the divine promise in Q 6:35 is thus quite conventional.¹¹

Kloppenborg insists that 6:35a be part of the Q-elaboration following verses 32-33, which "require some positive summarizing conclusion."¹² Schürmann also requires it as "Überleitung zu der Lohnverheißung V 35b.c."¹³ Both arguments have the sup-

⁹ Vaage, "Composite Texts," 82-83.

¹⁰ Lührmann, "Liebet," 425-26.

¹¹ See also *Golden Verses* 31, some of the Egyptian Instructions cited in chapter two, and elsewhere in Q: 6:42; 7:23; 10:21-22; 11:13; 12:11-12; 12:31.

¹² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 177.

¹³ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.354, to which we could add that there is

port of genre conventions. Not only is it unsatisfying to leave the rhetorical questions hanging without some cumulative conclusion which cashes in on the tacit response that they evoke, but verse 35a supplies (1) the expected closing admonition and (2) an inclusio with the opening admonition, both of which we saw to be recurrent features of ancient instructional speeches.¹⁴

The following schematization allows the affinities which the Love Your Enemies cluster has with ancient instructional speeches to emerge more clearly:¹⁵

Opening Admonition (27-28): Love your enemies and pray for those who abuse you.

Concretizing Admonitions (29-30): To whomever hits you on the cheek, turn the other also, and from the one taking your coat, do not withhold even your shirt. Give to the one who begs from you and from the one borrowing do not ask back.

no smooth transition between Matt 5:46-47 and 5:48. Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 110-11, agrees that the rhetorical questions “nach einem abschließenden Imperativ riefen,” but because his reconstruction of the cluster eliminates verse 35a, he is forced to make 6:36 fill the gap, while acknowledging that it really does not clearly pick up on the Love Your Enemies thematic.

¹⁴ It is thus unfortunate that the IQP eliminated 6:35a. The hesitancy of many to attribute verse 35a to Q in its present position can be traced to the tradition of scholarly advocacy for the Matthean arrangement of the Love Your Enemies material, in which the second occurrence of the opening admonition is absent. This goes back at least as far as Bultmann, *History*, 96, who credits the form of 6:27-35 to Luke's rearrangement of the Q material allegedly preserved by Matthew, a rearrangement in which Luke creates 6:35a to form a framework around his new composition. In this Bultmann is followed by Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 120-21, 131. It persists in Robinson, “Weisheit oder Prophetie,” 384, who though agreeing with the consensus that Luke best preserves the order of Q in this cluster still calls 35a a “redaktionelle” inclusio. Carruth, however, notes that “sandwich-embedding of sayings....is not a feature of Lukan redaction” (“Persuasion,” 60). Most scholars recognize that this cluster has been taken over by Matthew's anthithesis composition, and that Matthew could have removed the opening admonition (verse 27) and replaced it with his own antithesis, while preserving Q's final admonition with its motive clauses (verse 35) and transposing verses 32-33 between verses 35 and 36. See Hoffmann, “Situation,” 65, Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 105, and Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.345. Lührmann, “Liebet,” 416, suggests that the fact that Matthew raises the issue of “reward” (verse 46) but never resolves it, while in the Lukan sequence it is both raised and resolved in the promise of divine sonship in 35c, speaks for Matthew's fracturing of a structure which Luke preserves.

¹⁵ Here and throughout indentation is used to set off compositional sub-units.

Central Gnostic Admonition (31): And as you wish that people would
do to you, do so to them.

Concretizing Questions (32-34): If you love those who love you, what
reward have you? Do not even the tax col-
lectors...? And if you [greet/do good to]
your brothers, what reward do you have?
Do not even Gentiles do the same?

Closing Admonition (35a): Instead, love your enemies,
Promise (35cd): and you will be sons of the Most High,
Maxim; Paradigm because he raises his sun on the evil and on
the good and sends rain on the just and on
the unjust.

Verse 27 supplies the programmatic admonition for the entire cluster. It is a wisdom admonition, but one which “seems to have reversed the normal ways of the world.”¹⁶ It enunciates a topos—response to one’s enemies—of ancient wisdom literature,¹⁷ though it presents an idiosyncratic permutation of the relevant ethic, recommending behavior towards one’s enemy one normally reserves for one’s friends.¹⁸ Verse 35a supplies the recapitulation and inclusio.¹⁹ The fact that the final admonition lacks the second command, “pray for those who abuse you,” may be due to the fact that it responds to the second half of the cluster, which deals with reciprocity, whereas the second half of the first admonition anticipates the first part of the cluster, which deals with retaliation.

Between this framework lies supportive argumentation.²⁰ Succinct examples (verses 29-30), derived from recurring social situations, concretize the programmatic admonition.²¹ Aristotle recommended the use of examples in deliberative speech; moreover, “die Konkretisierung der Hauptmahnung mit einer kasuistischen, konditional formulierten Bestimmung” is a “beliebt” compositional

¹⁶ Edwards, *Theology*, 86; see also Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 21 (“Mahnwort”).

¹⁷ Piper, *Wisdom*, 83.

¹⁸ See Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 448-449: “Invite your friend, but not your enemy, to dine...”

¹⁹ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 102.

²⁰ See Betz, *Commentary*, 595.

²¹ Francois Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, EKKNT 3.1 (Zurich: Benzinger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 321; Piper, *Wisdom*, 111; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 365; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 126; Carruth, “Persuasion,”

technique in *Ps.-Phoc.* as well as in other instructional texts.²² The switch from plural to singular second person address is a rhetorical technique aimed at arresting attention, not a redaction-history indicator.²³ The emphatic positioning of the situation description at the beginning of the clauses indicates a shift to a descriptive mode away from the imperative mode of the programmatic admonitions of verse 27; moreover, though the situational examples are stated in admonitory form, yet their second person address and similarity in syntactic structure distinguish them from the admonitions of verse 27 and define them as a discrete unit.²⁴ The third recurring situation (verse 30), by focusing on giving and lending, anticipates the reciprocity discussion of verses 31-33.²⁵

Verse 31, the “Golden Rule,” is a gnomic saying expressed in admonitory form.²⁶ Its appearance in the heart of the composition flanked by descriptive, concretizing units replicates the “gnomic center” stylistic convention.²⁷ It coordinates the materials around it, picking up the admonitions to give and lend of verse 30 and by virtue of its affinity to the reciprocity ethic sets up Q’s interpretation of that ethic in verses 32-33.²⁸ The deployment of this

195; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 379; Betz, *Commentary*, 595. See also Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 69 (“focal instances”).

²² Thomas, *Phokylides*, 116; see also 117-118, citing *Ps.-Phoc.* 22-30, 208-209, 153-61.

²³ Carruth, “Persuasion,” 61-62, 194-95; see also Horsley, “Q and Jesus,” 185, adducing *Didache* 1:3-5 for comparison.

²⁴ Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 47-48, 69; Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 21; Hoffmann, “Situation,” 58-59, 64; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 176; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 55; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 379. The uniqueness of form remains whether one opts for Matthew’s introduction with ὅστις σε ῥατίζει or the dative-genitive participial openings attested in both Luke and Matthew: τῷ τύπτοντί σε... ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός/τῷ θέλοντί σοι... τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε....

²⁵ Here I differ from Betz, who links verses 29-30 more closely to verses 27-28, and verses 33-34 to verse 31, a view affected by his taking the Sermon on the Plain in its present form in Luke as Q^{Luke} material, in which 6:30 has in view begging and confiscatory expropriation rather than the reciprocity dynamics of borrowing and lending, as the IQP reconstructed Sermon has it (*Commentary*, 591-92, 595, 599).

²⁶ Hermann von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament*, WMANT 64 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 221; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 393-94.

²⁷ See Lührmann, “Liebet,” 419, and Petros Vassiliadis, “The Original Order of Q. Some Residual Cases,” in *Logia*, 379-87, esp. 385.

²⁸ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.343, and Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 422,

reciprocity gnome is a brazen, perhaps ironic appropriation of its sapiential authority and enjoyment of collective assent for the unconventional admonition to "love your enemies."²⁹ Its appeal to human preferences as a criterion for action, rather than to a divine command, is apposite to wisdom argumentation.³⁰

The parallel rhetorical questions which follow (verses 32-33) shift to a situational-concretizing mode and in this respect supply a counterpart to verses 29-30.³¹ Like the latter they are set off as a sub-unit by their distinct structure. A rhetorical question "functions primarily to invoke pathos because it serves...to intensify contact with the audience." Moreover, the "hearers seem to be brought to task and to have no answer. In this case the hearers are rendered speechless and the speaker remains the only one authorized to speak."³² The rhetorical question form also promotes the notion that the proposition is reasonable.³³ Rhetorical questions are a favorite linguistic form of Q; verses 32-33 are the first of many.

As Kloppenborg and Schürmann perceive, verse 35a serves to harness the unspoken assent evoked by the rhetorical questions to a recapitulating imperative. It also leads into the final motive unit which is both a promise and a final persuasive argument connecting the admonition to the character of God. As noted, promises in general and frequently promises with a divine reference are a common means of winding up an instructional speech. Appending a maxim conforms to a widely attested compositional practice in instructional speeches and to the recommendations of the rhetoricians. Though the promise of divine sonship in the Q context may have an eschatological tone, it blends without difficulty into the wisdom argumentation of this

emphasize its concluding function vis à vis verses 29-30, while Catchpole, "The Inaugural Discourse," in David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1993), 79-134, esp. 114, emphasizes how it forshadowes verses 32-33. Betz, *Commentary*, 591-92, takes verses 33-35 as commentary on the Golden Rule.

²⁹ Betz, *Commentary*, 518, 600; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 392.

³⁰ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 119; see also Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.352, Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 21, and Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 392.

³¹ Betz, *Commentary*, 601 ("derived from life experience").

³² Carruth, "Persuasion," 148 (citing Quintilian, 9.2.7; Demetrius, *Eloc.* 5.279).

³³ See Schenk, *Synopse*, 29, Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 387, Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 136, and Catchpole, "Inaugural Discourse," 109.

speech, both in terms of its conventional promise function and in its orientation to the present order of nature, calling attention to the daily mercies shown by the Creator to all creatures.³⁴ In this respect the final maxim, “He causes his sun to rise on the evil and the good and sends his rain on the just and unjust alike,” supplies the climactic wisdom motivation for the entire speech, for it grounds the programmatic admonition to “love your enemies” in the loving behavior of God even towards his enemies, a behavior observable in the recurring course of nature.³⁵ Hence, the final maxim is cumulative, for (1) God’s refusal to retaliate against his enemies grounds the non-retaliation commands of 6:29, and (2) his goodness even to those who spurn him supports the commands of 6:30, 32-33 to show kindness to those who cannot or will not reciprocate.

With the structure of 6:27-35 thus clarified, the transitional function of 6:36 emerges even more clearly.³⁶ The “heavenly Father” picks up on the reference to divine sonship in 6:35, while the admonition to mercy anticipates the Judge Not speech.³⁷

³⁴ Piper, *Wisdom*, 84; see also Sato, *Prophetie*, 223.

³⁵ Lührmann, “Liebet,” 437; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 183; Sato, *Prophetie*, 223; Betz, *Commentary*, 518. Much wisdom reflection on the wicked’s experience of the goods of creation tends to view this as a problem. Q uses it as a motivation to likewise act kindly and without retaliation towards one’s enemies. See Catchpole, “Inaugural Discourse,” 105-106, Gerd Theissen, *Social Reality and the Early Christians. Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament*, trans. Margaret Kroll (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 142-43, and von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 223, adducing *Sir* 12:6, 39:26, 27; 40:9-10; 50:7; *1 Enoch* 41:8; *Exod* 22:2-3; *Job* 8:16; *Qoh* 4:1, 3; 6:1; 8:9; 9:3; 10:5; *Wis* 5:6; *Psalm* 68:9; *Isa* 5:6; *Amos* 4:7-8.

³⁶ Bovon, *Lukas*, 323; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 120; Lührmann, “Liebet,” 422; Carruth, “Persuasion,” 86; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 181 (noting, however, its strong forward orientation); Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 403; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 103-104, 376; Catchpole, “Inaugural Discourse,” 119; Walter Grundmann, “Weisheit im Horizont des Reiches Gottes: Eine Studie zur Verkündigung Jesu nach der Spruchüberlieferung Q,” in *Die Kirche des Anfangs*, eds. Rudolf Schnackenburg, et al. (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1977), 175-99, esp. 190; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 110-11; *Kommentar*, 27. Because of his Sermon on the Plain = Q^{Luke} position, Betz carries the cluster’s composition forward to 6:37-38 (*Commentary*, 591-92, 614, 619).

³⁷ Rees Conrad Douglas uses the chreia elaboration model for compositional analysis of this cluster (“Family, Power, Religion,” 177-81; idem, “Love Your Enemies,” 116-31). Douglas takes verse 27 as the lead saying, 28b-30, 35a as paraphrase, verse 31 as rationale, 32-34 as argument from the contrary, 35b as argument from analogy, and 36 as concluding exhortation. The argumentative categories he employs are difficult to reconcile with the form-critical/syn-

We are now in a position to appraise the crucial hermeneutical function of the centrally-positioned "Golden Rule" gnome. Betz states, "Already prior to the SM [Sermon on the Mount], Judaism had established that the Golden Rule can serve as an integrating hermeneutical principle."³⁸ Verse 31, however, has long been a bone of contention in exegesis of the passage, for it seems to advocate a mild reciprocity ethic present in most everyday social relations and thus in collision with the radical ethic of the sayings flanking it.³⁹ Redaction-history solutions which view 6:31 as a secondary de-radicalization of 6:27-29 or some form of later addition must detach the text from its communicative situation; the same objection disqualifies theories positing the cluster's alleged thematic tensions. The first step out of the impasse is to affirm the dual principles that (1) a gnomic saying by nature is hermeneutically open and (2) as a result will always form a highly interactive hermeneutical relationship with its rhetorical context. Hence usage of the Golden Rule in one elaborative context cannot dictate the nature of its application in another context.⁴⁰ In antiquity the Golden Rule was invoked in a wide variety of paraenetic settings dealing with reciprocity and accordingly was made to display various shades of interpretation.⁴¹ In a similar manner the Love Enemies cluster, *every syllable of which is bound up in issues relating either to reciprocity or its flip side, retaliation*, expropriates the Golden Rule and infuses it with meaning from the unconventional Jesus ethic advocated by the encompassing materials.⁴²

tactic divisions of the cluster. They force assimilation of verse 28b to verses 29-30, which belong to different sub-units. Verses 29-30 are not so much paraphrases of the admonition as they are illustrations of it, but Douglas is forced to downplay this in order to keep verse 31 as the rationale and thus preserve some semblance of the rationale's usual position right after the opening maxim.

³⁸ Betz, *Commentary*, 518.

³⁹ See, for example, Myung-Soo Kim, *Die Trägergruppe von Q. Sozialgeschichtliche Forschung zur Q-Überlieferung in den synoptischen Evangelien*, Wissenschaftliche Beiträge aus Europäischen Hochschulen 1,1 (Hamburg: Verlag an der Lottbek, 1990), 155.

⁴⁰ See Betz, *Commentary*, 518, and Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 391.

⁴¹ Albrecht Dihle, "Goldene Regel," *RAC* 11 (1981) 930-40, esp. 930-33, 936.

⁴² Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 396, describes this aptly as "einer 'relecture' der Goldenen Regel...von Jesus her." See also Edwards, *Theology*, 42, Lührmann, "Liebet," 437, and Betz, *Commentary*, 58.

Nevertheless, the gnome's actualization in this new context constitutes an astonishing departure from its normal range of application—regulating relations of reciprocity among friends and neighbors and between patrons and clients in an agricultural society, where it undergirds the socially crucial obligation of mutual exchange of benefits, and where, conversely, the obligation to retaliate against one's enemies is affirmed.⁴³ Q's aphoristic expropriation of the Golden Rule, placing the rule *par excellence* of balanced reciprocity *paradoxically* in the heart of an instruction recommending, on the model of God's unilateral display of grace, love towards one's enemies and giving without expectation of reciprocal exchange, is disorienting and hence outrightly subversive.⁴⁴ By this means Q calls into question the mode of social relations the saying might usually epitomize and legitimate. Q 6:27-35, inclusive of verse 31, thus articulates *paradoxical, aphoristic wisdom* (which Beardslee notes is a sure indicator of dominical wisdom discourse), which expropriates and restates normative wisdom in order to critique and subvert the mode of social relations which it usually supports.⁴⁵ At the same time the enormous authority of the Golden Rule is claimed for a vision of a wholly different set of social relations; indeed, the Golden Rule, expressing as it does the foundational social norm of reciprocity, actually functions as a "starting mechanism" stimulating the kind of

⁴³ Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 342-363, gives classic expression to this double-edged reciprocity; see Paul Millet, "Hesiod and His World," *PCambPhS* 210, n.s. 30 (1984) 84-115, esp. 99-103. See also Alvin W. Gouldner, "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement," in *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*, ed. Steffen W. Schmidt, et al. (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977), 28-43, passim, James C. Scott, *The Moral Economy of the Peasant* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1976), 167-68, et passim, Halvor Moxnes, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*, OBT 23 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 133-34, and Vaage, *Upstarts*, 127.

⁴⁴ Hoffmann, "Situation," 69, argues that verses 32-33 are juxtaposed to the Golden Rule precisely to criticize this ethic; see also Vaage, *Upstarts*, 45.

⁴⁵ Beardslee, "Uses of the Proverb"; see also Paul Ricoeur, "The Golden Rule: Exegetical and Theological Perplexities," *NTS* 36 (1990) 392-97, esp. 396. On subversive use of traditional wisdom see Nierenberg, "Proverbs in Graffiti," 53, Leo G. Perdue, "The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature," in *Paranaesis: Act and Form = Semeia* 50, eds. Leo G. Perdue and John G. Gammie (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 5-39, and Gerd Theißen, "Jesusbewegung als charismatische Wertrevolution," *NTS* 35 (1989) 343-69, esp. 350-51.

interaction which brings into existence the social relations envisioned by the Love Enemies cluster.⁴⁶

This confirms our view of Q's text as a communicative event intensely engaged in a socially aggressive manner with its social context. It also shows the capacity of genre and composition to endow the text with dynamic, instrumental force in the situation of social interaction in which it is produced, for the pragmatic application of instruction is socialization—in Q's case resocialization—of the target audience into an alternative moral universe.

Judge Not (6:37-42)

Several scholars resort to redaction histories to explicate the formation of this cluster, largely because the disciple-teacher saying of verse 40—or verses 39 and 40—seems to break the topical coherence, based on the prohibition of condemnatory judging and slander, of 6:37-38 (39) and 6:41-42.⁴⁷ Redaction histories eliminate such difficulties by positing a primitive sequence of sayings in which thematic transitions were smooth, disrupted by later interpolations in the service of some redactional interest or other. In the case of 6:37-42, several quite different histories have been proposed, all of which explain the facts equally well.

Schürmann argues that first, verse 40 “wird mit V. 39 zusammengewachsen sein” as an illustrative commentary, and second, this *Grundwort-Kommentarwort* combination was connected to verses 41-42. This sequence of events is demanded by the fact that since verse 39 and verses 41-42 go together thematically, both dealing with blindness, no one would have violated an alleged primitive connection of verses 39, 41-42 by wedging in verse 40, which has nothing to do with blindness.⁴⁸ One is immediately

⁴⁶ Gouldner, “Norm of Reciprocity,” 39; see also Nierenberg, “Proverbs in Graffiti,” 53, Ricoeur, “Golden Rule,” 394-97, Theißen, *Social Reality*, 122, 124, 131, and Ronald A. Piper, “The Language of Violence and the Aphoristic Sayings in Q: A Study of Q 6:27-36,” in *Conflict and Invention*, 53-72, esp. 64-66.

⁴⁷ Schürmann, “Die Warnung des Lukas vor der Falschlehrer in der ‘Predigt am Berge’ Lk 6,20-49,” in Heinz Schürmann, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968), 290-309, esp. 296.

⁴⁸ Schürmann, “Falschlehrer,” 297. Following the Lukan division, Schürmann takes 6:39-45 to be an anti-pharisaic cluster (*Lukasevangelium* 1.366-70; “Falschlehrer,” 294).

driven to ask: if verse 40 was seen by some early redactor to be a good commentary on the blindness parable of verse 39, why should its primitive insertion between two units on blindness present a difficulty? Schürmann's theory is supplemented by Wanke, who suggests that the anti-pharisaic verses 39-40 were inserted into another primitive unit consisting of verses 37-38, 41-42, since verses 39-40 disturb a smooth connection between the former.⁴⁹

This reconstruction of events is predicated solely upon sensitive detection of delicate thematic differentials between the various units and is itself somewhat conflicted. On the one hand it is proposed (Schürmann) that verse 40 is a primitive *Kommentarwort* to verse 39, since it breaks the thematic connection of verse 39 to verses 41-42, which would never have happened were verses 39, 41-42 a primitive unity. On the other hand it is asserted (Wanke) that the anti-pharisaic verses 39-40 together disrupt a primitive connection between verses 37-38 and verses 41-42. But verse 39 obviously has some thematic affinity to the primitive cluster it is allegedly interrupting since by common agreement it forms a smooth sequence with verses 41-42 with verse 40 removed.

Another group of scholars produces a redaction history which reverses the course of events reconstructed by Schürmann by positing that the master-pupil saying belongs in an undetermined part of Q (Matthew has it elsewhere) and that Luke, obviously not concerned about separating verse 39 from verses 41-42, has inserted it here, thereby disrupting the smooth thematic connection between verses 39 and 41-42.⁵⁰ This proposal suffers from the weakness or lack of attempts to supply Luke's rationale for inserting the master-pupil saying precisely here; rather, its non-sensical presence is contrasted with the sensible sequence which it disturbs (verses 39, 41-42). But Luke must have had some reason for the alleged insertion of verse 40. The rub is that if that

⁴⁹ Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 213, who, however, reasons that verse 40 was attached to verse 39 at a primitive stage, since by itself it is not anti-pharisaic, but only by virtue of its connection with verse 39; similarly Sato, *Prophetic*, 36.

⁵⁰ Catchpole, "Inaugural Discourse," 80, 127; Piper, *Wisdom*, 40-41; Vaage, "Composite Texts," 80-84; Philip Sellew, "Argument and Design in the Q Sermon," unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, November 18, 1990, 9; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 134.

reason can be divined, it may be possible, without an ironclad case for the influence of Lukan redactional interests, to attribute verse 40's present position to the Q redactor, since the theory of Lukan insertion is predicated upon difficulties in seeing a reason for its present position.⁵¹

Steinhauser argues that the catchword connections between verses 39 and 41-42 (τυφλός, ὀφθαλμός) indicate interpolation of verse 40. However, he attributes this insertion to the Q redactor who worked a primitive anti-pharisaic cluster into the Sermon. The insertion transformed the cluster from anti-pharisaic polemic into an instruction directed to community teachers.⁵² Jacobson reaches a conclusion the exact opposite of Steinhauser's: Q redaction transformed the cluster from "inner-community exhortation" into polemic against opponents as part of the larger redaction of Q directing it against "this generation." The less polemical verse 40 is a left-over from the cluster's previous stage which the polemical redaction was unable to absorb, for allegedly there is no commentary connection between it and the polemical verses 39, 41-42.⁵³

This review shows that thematic and social-history analyses of this cluster which proceed without invoking literary-critical criteria tend to produce a number of equally plausible but incompatible redaction histories.

If 6:37-42 as a whole is viewed as a specimen of instructional speech, it displays affinities with the conventions of that genre:⁵⁴

Admonition and Motives (37-38): And judge not, lest you be judged;
for with the judgment you judge you

⁵¹ Piper, *Wisdom*, suggests that Luke tends to have "the theme of blindness or lack of understanding" be followed "by the theme of recognition and instruction" (41), but it is not clear that his citation of 4:18 and 7:21 supports this alleged Lukan redactional trait: 4:18 is embedded in a citation from Isaiah; neither refers to instruction (but rather to miracles), nor does 6:40 refer to sight; 7:21 compensates for Luke's elimination of miracle stories prior to the query from John.

⁵² Michael G. Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte in die synoptischen Evangelien. Eine form- und traditionskritische Studie*, FzB 44 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1981), 92.

⁵³ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 106-107; for a critique see Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 185-86.

⁵⁴ This connection is recognized and described by Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 147. See also Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 403. Schulz's analysis is restricted to the truncated Matthean version.

will be judged and with the measure you measure it will be measured to you.

Gnomic Comparison (39): Can a blind person lead a blind person? Will not both fall into a pit?

Central Gnomic Saying (40): A disciple is not above the teacher, but every one, when well trained, will be like his teacher.

Gnomic Comparison (41,42a) Why do you see the speck that is in your brother's eye, but the log in your eye you do not notice? How can you say to your brother: Let me remove the speck from your eye, and behold, there is a log in your eye?

Closing Admonition and Promise (Maxim) (42b): Hypocrite! Remove first from your eye the log, and then you will see clearly to cast the speck from your brother's eye.

The opening admonition is a wisdom admonition (prohibition) with motive clauses. Standing programmatically at the beginning, it remains, like most maxims, open-ended, general, and hence in need of specification and application.⁵⁵ The second motive clause, "with the measure you measure it will be measured to you," is itself a wisdom saying which lends gnomic authority to the opening admonition.⁵⁶ It argues by virtue of the collective assent given to the wisdom observation which it encapsulates; whether a divine sanction is threatened depends on whether one takes the passives as divine passives.⁵⁷ Its pictorial nature adds vividness to the programmatic admonition and begins to unfold its significance.⁵⁸ The admonitory maxim together with its motive clauses "raises the issue of competence. Who is knowledgeable and authorized to issue verdicts?"⁵⁹

The next unit, verse 39, is a gnome expressed as two rhetorical questions.⁶⁰ Rhetorical questions appealing to wisdom obser-

⁵⁵ Piper, *Wisdom*, 37-37; Betz, *Commentary*, 489-90; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 381; Sato, *Prophetie*, 277; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 213.

⁵⁶ Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 10.

⁵⁷ See Sato, *Prophetie*, 219, von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 213, and Piper, *Wisdom*, 44.

⁵⁸ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 113-14; Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 10.

⁵⁹ Betz, *Commentary*, 491.

⁶⁰ Betz, *Commentary*, 620, cites Xenophon *Mem.* 1.3.4; Plato *Rep.* 6,484c;

vations or social norms, frequently placed in either the second or penultimate position (or both) in the instructional speeches, are a pervasive feature of Q composition.⁶¹ The questions of 6:39 are, as noted, gnomic and vividly illustrative.⁶² The parable depicting the blind leading the blind occurs frequently in educational settings.⁶³ It (along with 6:40) thus interprets the general admonition, "Judge not," in the direction of competence and incompetence as regards moral teachers and their leadership. Some who judge thereby arrogate for themselves moral leadership positions for which they are seriously unqualified.⁶⁴ The hilarious images evoked by the rhetorical questions subvert such claims with ridicule.

Verse 40 is a proverb, or two coordinated proverbs, depicting the educational relationship between sage and disciple.⁶⁵ It encapsulates the ancient ideal of education by mimesis: imitation of the master with the goal of likewise becoming a sage.⁶⁶ Κατηρτισμένοϛ in particular tends to have correctional, educative processes in view.⁶⁷ The double gnome implicitly promises elevation in status—from unwise to wise—by virtue of attachment to the wisdom teacher, and thus can function protreptically.⁶⁸ In striking contrast to the deluded fools of verse 39, verse 40 profiles the true sage and the model of correction which produces wisdom.⁶⁹ The two verses are antithetically parallel: both have one person leading/educating another; both entail a result, one disastrous,

7,518c; Epictetus *Diss.* 3.22.26; Sextus Empiricus *Pyrrhoniae Hypotheses* 3.259; Philo *Virt* 7; Plutarch *Ad principem ineredutum* 2,780 as parallels.

⁶¹ Already seen in 6:32-33; see also 6:41-42, 44; 7:24-26; 11:11-12 (also the disputed 11:5-8); 11:18-19; 11:40; 12:6; 12:23-24, 28; 12:42; 12:56; 15:4.

⁶² Edwards, *Theology*, 89; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 127; Carruth, "Persuasion," 167.

⁶³ Betz, *Commentary*, 82, 621.

⁶⁴ Piper, *Wisdom*, 40; Carruth, "Persuasion," 308-309.

⁶⁵ Betz, *Commentary*, 624-25.

⁶⁶ Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 22; Piper, *Wisdom*, 131; Carruth, "Persuasion," 167-68, 251; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 194; Edwards, *Theology*, 89; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 174; Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, SBLMS 20 (Cambridge and Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 91-93.

⁶⁷ Betz, *Commentary*, 624-25.

⁶⁸ Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 12; Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 20; Bovon, *Lukas*, 333; Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 91; Edwards, *Theology*, 89; Betz, *Commentary*, 622, 625.

⁶⁹ Juxtaposition of contrasting proverbs is a well-attested sapiential technique. See, for example, Prov 26:4-5.

the other successful, one a fall, the other an elevation. The importance of the positive portrayal of the sage-disciple relationship is secured by its placement in the center of the composition.

Like verse 39, their counterpart in the arrangement, verses 41-42a consist of two rhetorical questions which depict a ridiculous scene: those with delusions of being able to correct others are portrayed with logs sticking out of their eyes while they attempt to pluck specks from the eyes of others.⁷⁰ These questions too are based on a gnomic comparison.⁷¹ That these verses refer to an educational setting is corroborated by the appearance of a similar saying in *b. 'Arak* 16b where it likewise refers to the educational process of reproof and correction.⁷² The deployment of vivid, even hyperbolic examples is germane to wisdom argumentation, as is the use of direct address and rhetorical questions which pull listeners personally into the instruction, force them to acknowledge its truth, and in this case (as in 6:32-35), render them receptive to the final admonition.⁷³ Thus these rhetorical questions sustain the instruction's movement from the general, open-ended admonition of 6:37-38 to the specific, inescapable application in 6:42b, all the while drawing the listener or reader more and more into its orbit through the use of humor, charming stories, and common wisdom, followed up with sudden changes of mood such as we find in verses 41-42.⁷⁴

Besides the fact that both 6:39 and 6:41-42a are rhetorical questions based on sight-gags, they are correlated through key words from the semantic field of "sight"—*τυφλός, ὀφθαλμός, βλέπεις, κατανοεῖς*—with the total blindness of verse 39 gradually giving way to the "seeing clearly" (*διαβλέψεις*) of the final admonition.⁷⁵ In addition, both ridicule fallacious claims to guidance, specified by 6:41-42a as moral guidance ("Hypocrite!").⁷⁶

⁷⁰ Piper, *Wisdom*, 40; Schürmann, "Falschlehrer," 297.

⁷¹ Carruth, "Persuasion," 168, noting the ease with which the elements of 6:41-42 can be converted to gnomic sayings.

⁷² Cited by Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 103-104; see also Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 316.

⁷³ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 115; Edwards, *Theology*, 90; Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 14-15; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.371.

⁷⁴ Piper, *Wisdom*, 36-37.

⁷⁵ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 381; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 182; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 92, 191; Piper, *Wisdom*, 40, Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 403.

⁷⁶ Sevenich Bax, *Konfrontation*, 381; Schürmann, "Falschlehrer," 295; Catchpole, "Inaugural Discourse," 127; see also Schenk, *Synopse*, 31.

So though all three of the central units are gnomic, verses 39 and 41-42a are correlated with each other and starkly contrasted with the central gnomic saying, 6:40, where the true sage's educative, corrective competence is set forth positively and soberly. The three units taken together, therefore, constitute a *synkrisis*.

Though 6:42b maintains the images of log and splinter, its shift to imperative voice marks it out as the concluding admonition which applies the instruction directly and specifically to the auditors.⁷⁷ It repeats the opening prohibition, but in different words and in an inverted form: the opening prohibition counseled against judging others; the closing admonition urges self-judgment before setting up shop as a moral guide to others. The statement, "...cast out the speck from the eye of your brother," in effect reiterates the opening admonition, though (along with the epithet "Hypocrite!") it specifies the opening "judge not" as being pretentious moral correction, and along with "first remove from your own eye the log" spells out the conditions under which one might indeed venture to "judge."⁷⁸ Thus 6:42b forms an antithetical inclusio with 6:37-38, signaling the end of the instruction and offering a direct application of its programmatic admonition.⁷⁹ It is also cumulative, for the "hypocrite!" epithet and use of the sight-blindness metaphor recall all of 6:37-39, 41-42a, while the reference to proper moral guidance picks up on the central gnomic sayings (6:40).

With the compositional arrangement of 6:37-42 clarified, the crucial function of the central saying (6:40) also becomes clear. It functions in a coordinating manner, for the disciple-teacher image gives positive expression to the leadership theme depicted in a bad light in 6:39, while the reference to the corrective training of the disciple anticipates the final admonition, which demands the exercise of self-criticism as the prerequisite to offering moral guidance to others. Also significant is the arrangement by which 6:40 is flanked by two units, 6:39, 41-42a, to whose ridiculous parodies of pretentious, incompetent, and hypocritical moral leader-

⁷⁷ See Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 430, Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 115, and Schürmann, "Falschlehrer," 297. Betz, *Commentary*, 626, describes it as "a gnomic sentence in two parts employing the form 'do this..., and then....'"

⁷⁸ See Carruth, "Persuasion," 252, and Betz, *Commentary*, 493, 627.

⁷⁹ Piper, *Wisdom*, 36, 42, and Betz, *Commentary*, 493.

ship it offers the strongest possible contrast. Verse 40 resolves the deliberative issue treated by the cluster: who is qualified to offer moral guidance?⁸⁰ The sage master of 6:40 is an oblique reference to Jesus, and this double-saying promises that those who attach themselves to him as disciples (and not to the blind guides of 6:39) will some day be so qualified.⁸¹ We saw a strikingly similar compositional arrangement likewise dealing with the question of “who is qualified to judge” in *Ps.-Phoc.* 79-96, especially lines 86-90. A central gnomic saying, “A wise man examines wisdom, and a fellow craftsman crafts” (88), profiles the competent sage, while the two sayings which flank it warn against letting the ignorant and uneducated be judges. Q 6:37-42, therefore, performs a wisdom topos.

In the heart of this cluster the authoritative claims of Jesus are uncompromisingly advanced. The compositional arrangement urges submission to the master (6:40) in place of arrogant presumption of leadership (6:39, 41-42). Jesus offers himself as a reliable pattern for mimesis and outbids the authority of competing guides in staggering proportions, both in the way he parodies their leadership and in the brief but unmistakable echo of ὡς ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν (6:36) in ὡς διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, the effect of which is to equate mimesis of this master with mimesis of the heavenly Father.⁸² As in *Ps.-Phoc.* 86-90, “the σοφός serves as a paradigm of the ethos that the passage is striving to develop....”⁸³ The composition negotiates an honor-shame transaction: it equates Jesus’ moral authority with God’s and his instructional claims with those conventional to ancient sages, while depicting those around him who make similar authoritative claims foolishly tumbling into pits or with logs protruding from their eye sockets, thus associating his teaching with sightedness, his competitors’ with blindness.

⁸⁰ See Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.369, idem, “Falschlehrer,” 295-96, and Edwards, *Theology*, 89. Interpretations of the cluster which take it as directed in a warning manner at community teachers underestimate the intensity with which would-be guides are ridiculed, parodied, and charged with blindness.

⁸¹ See Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 107.

⁸² We saw a virtually identical compositional linking technique at work in *Sentences of Sextus* 306-311. On the claim to divine mimesis being advanced here see Kloppenborg, “Easter Faith,” 87, idem, *Formation*, 184-85, and Carruth, “Persuasion,” 167-68.

⁸³ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 119, on *Ps.-Phoc.* 88.

Trees, Fruit, and Speech (6:43-45)

Because this speech is so compact and thematically unified, it has not been the object of redaction-history analyses. Its composition can be set forth as follows:

- Maxim (43):* There is no sound tree that bears bad fruit,
nor again an unsound tree that bears good fruit.
- Gnomic Reason (44a):* For by its fruit the tree is known.
- Gnomic Comparisons (44b):* Do they gather from thorns figs, or from a
bramble bush grapes?
- Maxim (45a):* The good person from the good treasure brings
forth good things, but the evil one from the
evil treasure brings forth evil.
- Gnomic Reason (45b):* For from an abundance of the heart the mouth
speaks.

This speech is distinguished by its lack of explicit admonitions; rather, it is a gnomic commentary on the wisdom topos of good speech. Nevertheless, it resembles the Q instructions studied so far in several important respects. It opens with a proverb which, taken alone, is susceptible of application to any number of specific contexts.⁸⁴ The appending of a gnomic reason clause (6:44a) to the opening maxim creates a conventional wisdom-speech opening.⁸⁵ The reason clause supports the opening maxim in an almost tautological manner; however, it injects the idea of “knowing” (γινώσκειν) how to identify the good and the bad trees and by so doing articulates the specific instructional burden of this speech hinted at by the opening maxim—how one can distinguish good from bad—the suggestion being that one does so by tasting the fruit.⁸⁶ Thereby the two opening maxims lay a certain responsibility upon the hearers and thus function implicitly as an admonition. In this respect the opening maxim + reason, though still opaque as regards its application, functions programmatically for the whole cluster.

Verse 44b supports the opening maxims by adducing an exam-

⁸⁴ Piper, *Wisdom*, 48; Perdue, “Wisdom Sayings,” 8-9; Betz, *Commentary*, 628.

⁸⁵ Schürmann, “Falschlehrer,” 300; Carruth, “Persuasion,” 252.

⁸⁶ Piper, *Wisdom*, 48; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 93-94, 318-19; see also Betz, *Commentary*, 629.

ple from agriculture which shows self-evidently the impossibility of gleaning beneficial fruit from barren, even harmful trees.⁸⁷ The framing of the example as a rhetorical question helps coerce the assent of the auditors and corresponds to Q's compositional practice seen in 6:32-33, 39, 42-42a.⁸⁸ Though σταφυλὰς and σῦκα correspond to καρπὸν καλόν, and ἀκάνθων and τριβόλων "konkretisieren" δένδρον σαπρόν, 44b is a separate unit, since it is "mit dem Kontext syntaktisch in keiner Weise verknüpft, bildet also einen autosemantischen Satz."⁸⁹ The image is that of harvesters picking good fruit from good trees; hence the cluster sustains and makes more vivid the motif of the hearers as the ones who must discern where the good fruit is to be found.

Verse 45 then repeats the formal pattern of the cluster's opening: a two-line maxim (45a) is grounded and specified in a one-line gnomic reason clause (45b).⁹⁰ This formal similarity indicates an inclusio, or better, a framework (enclosing a single example), in either case a signaling of closure.⁹¹ Semantic correspondence between the opening antithesis of καλός, σαπρός and the closing antithesis of ἀγαθός, πονηρός facilitates recognition of a mutually interpretive framework.⁹² Though itself gnomic, 6:45 translates the horticultural metaphor into human terms and gives a moral specification to the highly figurative gnomes of 6:43-44: the human heart is the locus of good and evil, and a person's nature, whether it is good or evil, is discerned from speech. Good or bad trees are decoded as good or bad people, and good or bad fruit as good or bad speech.⁹³ The movement from general to specific and from the metaphorical to the human continues even within this last unit: the maxim (verse 45a) opens up for the first time the human moral realm, but sustains the metaphorical mode of discourse (treasures, good things, bad things); the concluding gnome (verse 45b) throws off the vestiges of metaphor and makes direct reference to the human heart and to human

⁸⁷ Piper, *Wisdom*, 48-49.

⁸⁸ Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 14-15; Carruth, "Persuasion," 121-22.

⁸⁹ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 376-77.

⁹⁰ Schürmann, "Falschlehrer," 301; Catchpole, "Inaugural Discourse," 130; Piper, *Wisdom*, 47; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 383; Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 9.

⁹¹ Piper, *Wisdom*, 47.

⁹² Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 383, 431.

⁹³ See Carruth, "Persuasion," 253.

speech. The instruction thus concludes by giving the hearers a criterion for separating good from bad people, namely, testing their speech.⁹⁴ The cluster displays a classic wisdom mode of argumentation, beginning from a general and programmatic maxim and moving incrementally through arguments appealing to human reason to a specific application.⁹⁵

The Trees, Fruit, and Speech cluster has an associative connection with the Judge Not instruction.⁹⁶ The discussion of good and bad speech picks up on the contrast of good and bad moral guidance, and the “bad trees, bad fruit” designate the questionable moral character and defective instruction of the would-be moral guides.⁹⁷ The Judge Not cluster raises the problem of false moral guides; the Trees, Fruit, and Speech cluster follows this up with a series of gnomic sayings comparing them to bramble bushes and thorns and driving home to hearers their responsibility to exercise discernment.⁹⁸ It translates the wise-foolish contrast of the Judge Not cluster into the more explicit moral terms of “good-bad.” Now the very nature of the incompetent guides is characterized as bad, which in turn contaminates their speech.⁹⁹ Finally, verses 43-45 sustain the *synkrisis* of 6:39-42 by referring

⁹⁴ Schürmann, “Falschlehrer,” 298, 301; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 182-83; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 432-33; Piper, *Wisdom*, 49; Zeller, *Kommentar*, 34; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 319-20; Wanke, “Kommentarworte,” 214-15. Catchpole, “Inaugural Discourse,” 130-31, imputes too much significance to the change in metaphor initiated by 45a when he argues on that basis that the cluster does not offer a unified elaboration.

⁹⁵ Piper, *Wisdom*, 48-47, 51.

⁹⁶ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 432-33, notes that 6:45b, with its reference to speech (λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα) picks up verse 42’s reference to λέγειν; similarly Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 252.

⁹⁷ Alternatively, the cluster functions protreptically as a promise in relation to the sage’s invitation in 6:40: those who attach themselves to the sage will become like trees bearing good fruit: “The invitation to hear and obey comes from the master sage and results in productive students. Wisdom is efficacious in the lives of those who receive her” (Gerald T. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament* [Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1980], 54, on *Sir* 24:19-22 and 39:13-14).

⁹⁸ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 182-83, Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 400, 430-33, and Steinhäuser, *Doppelbildworte*, 89-90, 318-19. More vexed is the question of whether these bad teachers are inside or outside of the community. Because the cluster depicts them as morally contaminated at the root of their being and in the context of 6:39-42 labels them as blind and subjects them to withering ridicule, they should be viewed as outsiders.

⁹⁹ Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 412.

to the good trees, fruit, and good speech, while the oblique reference to Jesus (6:40) is made explicit by the very next saying, which urges obedience to Jesus' words (6:46), thus like 6:40 indicating that his words are good and that he is worthy of imitation.¹⁰⁰

Confident Prayer (11:2-13)

So thematically integrated is this cluster that virtually every Q scholar takes it to be a unity in its present form.¹⁰¹ Perdue suggests that the composition replicates Lang's *Lehrrede* pattern derived from Prov 1-9, with 11:9-11 forming the "main section" and 11:13 the "conclusion."¹⁰² Lacking, however, is the introductory "call to heed"; moreover, the *a minore ad maius* conclusion does not conform to the conclusion of a *Lehrrede*, which contrasts the fates of the righteous and the wicked. Catchpole proposes a compositional pattern consisting of a heading (11:2-4), two illustrative arguments (11:5-8, 11-12), and summary (11:13), with the gnomes of 11:9-10 characterized as a subsequent "editorial interruption."¹⁰³ Catchpole perceives the obvious compositional regularity of this cluster; however, the gnomic verses 9-10 are designated redactional, it seems, because they distort the proposed pattern, for the admonition to "ask" fits superbly into the instruction, and as Schürmann notes, verses 11-13 comment on 11:9-10.¹⁰⁴ Piper offers an analysis which in stark contrast to Catchpole's designates the maxims of 11:9-10 as the programmatic opening for a "general maxim to specific application" elaborative pattern terminating in the *a minore ad maius* argument of 11:13 via the two illustrative rhetorical questions of 11:11-12.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ Carruth, "Persuasion," 251.

¹⁰¹ See, for example, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 204-205, Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 158, and Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 163. Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 2.207, 220; idem, "Zeugnis der Redenquelle," 151, produces a diachronic history along the lines of his *Grundwort*, *Zusatzwort*, *Ergänzungswort*, *Spruchpaar* categories, while affirming the integrity of the cluster's present form.

¹⁰² Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 22-23.

¹⁰³ Catchpole, "Law and Prophets," 99.

¹⁰⁴ See above, note 101.

¹⁰⁵ Piper, *Wisdom*, 21. Crossan, *In Fragments*, 97, designates 11:9-13 an "aphoristic compound."

The only drawback of Piper's analysis is its inability to draw the adjacent and clearly related Lord's Prayer (11:2-4) into this scenario, while Catchpole accounts for the Lord's prayer but not 11:9-10.

My arguments for following Catchpole in including the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8) in Q are set forth in *Documenta Q* (forthcoming), and will not be rehearsed here, other than to note that the sequence of programmatic instruction (11:2-4) + illustrative rhetorical question [11:5-8] + central gnomes (11:9-10) + illustrative rhetorical questions (11:11-12) + closing application (11:13) is characteristic of Q composition, replicating the arrangement of Q 6:37-42 (Judge Not), and, as we shall see, of Q 12:22-31 (Do not be Anxious), as well as approximating to the structure of Q 6:27-35 (Love Your Enemies). It seems unlikely this compositional similarity resulted from an *ad hoc* Lukan editorial intervention which inserted alleged *Sondergut* into a Q sequence of 11:2-4, 9-13.¹⁰⁶

The arrangement of Q 11:2-13 can be represented as follows:

Programmatic Admonition (2-4): [He said to them, "When you pray,] pray, 'Father, let your name be sanctified; let your kingdom come. Our day's bread give us today; and pardon our debts as we too have pardoned those in debt to us; and do not bring us to the test.'"]

Example (5-8): [Which of you (τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν) who has a friend will go to him at midnight and say to him, "Friend, lend me three

¹⁰⁶ Lukan editorial intervention into Q 11:5-8 which establishes a connection with the *Sondergut* parable of the Wicked Judge (18:1-8) is another matter; see David R. Catchpole, "Q and 'The Friend at Midnight' (Luke xi.5-8.9)," *JTS* 34 (1983) 407-24, esp. 412-19, and idem, "Q, Prayer, and the Kingdom: A Rejoinder," *JTS* 40 (1989) 377-88, esp. 383, 386. The IQP voted to exclude it from Q, influenced by the following considerations: (1) a commendable methodological caution with regard to including single-attestation passages in Q; (2) a less commendable reluctance (actually stated explicitly by one of the respondents, who argued that the appearance of compositional regularities likely points to Luke's redactional hand working on the Q "tradition") to attribute literarily sophisticated compositional regularities to Q at all (betraying the influence of *Kleinliteratur* conceptions), leading members to ignore the argument from compositional parallels adduced from elsewhere in Q. The respondents also failed to engage at all (even if only to reject) with Catchpole's important arguments (see articles cited above).

loaves”....he will get up and give him as much as he needs.]

Central Gnostic Sayings (9-10): I tell you, ask and it will be given to you, seek and you will find, knock and it will be opened to you. For everyone who asks receives, and the one who seeks finds, and to the one who knocks it will be opened.

Example (11-12) What person of you, (τίς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν) if his son asks for a loaf of bread, will give him a stone, or if he asks for a fish, will give him a snake?

Closing Application (11:13): If you, therefore, although you are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the father from heaven give good things to those who ask him!

The admonitory nature of the programmatic opening is secured by the minimally reconstructable imperative προσεύχεσθε. The model prayer is an extension of this imperative, not part of the motivational apparatus. (Schürmann is correct to call it the *Grundwort*). That prayer can supply a programmatic topic for a wisdom speech is attested by *Any* 4:1-6:

Do not raise your voice in the house of god,
He abhors shouting;
Pray by yourself with a loving heart,
Whose every word is hidden.
He will grant your needs,
He will hear your words,
He will accept your offerings.
Libate for your father and mother,
Who are resting in the Valley;
When the gods witness your action,
They will say: “Accepted.”
Do not forget the one outside,
Your son will act for you likewise.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ See also *Onchsheshonqy* 28.1.10, *Sir* 7:14; 21:1, 5; 28:2-5; 37:15; 39:5, and *Wis* 7-9; 16:28-29. Perdue, *Wisdom and Cult*, 60, 200, 222-23, demonstrates that cult, sacrifice, and prayer were recurring topics for wisdom reflection. Thus one cannot go along with Horsley when he asserts that the Q prayer cluster does “not correspond to conventional forms of wisdom” (“Logoi Propheton?” 205).

This Egyptian instruction opens with two antithetical programmatic admonitions on the proper model for prayer, supported by three motive clauses which guarantee that the deity hears and will answer, and thus supplies a parallel to the Q prayer instruction. It cannot be determined if the Q cluster opened with "When you pray..." (ὅταν προσεύχησθε...), since only Luke offers this reading, but if so it would correspond to the type of instruction-speech opening which Kayatz has labeled "kasuistische", namely, an introductory positing of a recurring life situation with a "when" or "if" clause, followed by a set of instructions for skillful management of that situation.¹⁰⁸ So no matter how one construes the opening of the cluster—the minimal imperative opening or the chreïic and situation-bound introductions attested in Luke—all are form-critically appropriate programmatic openings for an instructional speech. Cohesion in the cluster is created by the recurrence of ἄρτος: ἄρτον...ἄρτους...ἄρτον (verses 3, 5, 11), and by δὸς...δοῦναι...δώσει...δώσει...δοθήσεται...ἐπιδώσει...δόματα...διδόναι...δώσει (verses 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13). Additionally, the entire composition is dominated by motifs derived from the semantic field of patron-client relations: cultivation of patronage relations (11:2-4), cooperative friendship between households (11:5-8), and cooperative relations within the patriarchal household (11:11-13) constitute a complete list of the triad of survival strategies resorted to by subsistence-level peasants in agricultural societies.¹⁰⁹ Catchpole notes that all three "bread" references are predicated upon the notion that bread is a subsistence necessity, that bread supplies need to be renewed daily, and that supply of bread is a critical matter of prayer.¹¹⁰

The programmatic instructional section (11:2-4) is followed by an illustrative unit, the Friend at Midnight, framed, as is typical of Q, as a rhetorical question. By invoking socio-cultural norms governing friendship, hospitality, and honor, this example

¹⁰⁸ Kayatz, *Studien*, 15, 26-27. *Ad Demonium* is also replete with situational instructions.

¹⁰⁹ See Eric R. Wolf, "Kinship, Friendship, and Patron-Client Relations in Complex Societies," in *Friends, Followers, and Factions*, 167-77, William R. Herzog II, *Parables as Subversive Speech. Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994), 204-11, and Richard A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995), 200-205.

¹¹⁰ Catchpole, "Friend at Midnight," 421.

grounds the programmatic admonition to pray by analogously binding God, the divine patron, to obligations of friendship and in turn linking that obligation to provision of bread.

The gnomic pedigree of the central sayings (11:9-10) is unimpeachable.¹¹¹ Moreover, "structurally 11:9-10 provides an excellent example of a sapiential exhortation, consisting of imperatives with a carefully balanced motive clause."¹¹² Verses 9-10 are enthymemic in form; enthymemes may appear anywhere within a speech provided they are not concatenated to the point of inducing tedium. The mid-speech position of this enthymeme is, moreover, an indicator that 11:5-8 preceded it in Q, for in rhetorical practice the assertions of an enthymeme appearing in the middle of a speech commonly draw upon premises supplied by "proofs" preceding it in the speech.¹¹³ In accordance with their character as gnomic sayings, 11:9-10 are hermeneutically open. Their present context recruits their gnomic insight to ground and motivate the cluster's programmatic concern for bold prayer.¹¹⁴ The admonitory form of 11:9 replicates the pattern of 6:31, the central gnome of the Love Your Enemies instruction. With the explicit command αἰτεῖτε, and the promise δοθήσεται, verses 9-10 anticipate verses 11-13 (αἰτήσῃ...αἰτήσῃ...διδόναι), which in their turn root the optimism of these central sayings in God's fatherhood.¹¹⁵

Verses 9-10 echo the collective wisdom that one must act to get a desired result, that actions generally bring results.¹¹⁶ However, the spare Q formulation asserts the certainty of that result with an optimism which may seem unjustified when measured against actual experience.¹¹⁷ Nevertheless, within the surrounding

¹¹¹ Betz, *Commentary*, 501.

¹¹² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 204; see also Piper, *Wisdom*, 17, and Betz, *Commentary*, 504.

¹¹³ Conley, "Enthymeme in Perspective," 175, 182-83, a fact which also would explain why 11:9-10, taken alone, appears excessively optimistic and tautological.

¹¹⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 204.

¹¹⁵ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 163.

¹¹⁶ See Betz, *Commentary*, 504-505.

¹¹⁷ On the coherence and contrast verses 9-10 show with respect to traditional wisdom see Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.215-16, Catchpole, "Friend at Midnight," 418-19, idem, "Rejoinder," 385, Piper, *Wisdom*, 17, and Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, rev. ed. (London: SCM, 1971), 159-60. See also Betz, *Commentary*, 504-505.

context in which the kingdom is expected (11:2b) and the divine patron addressed in the prayer is honor-bound by the social obligations of friendship (11:5-8) and the closest bond of kinship (11:11-13), the optimism of the central gnomes becomes credible.¹¹⁸ Thus the device of framing gnomic material by explanatory units, the combination of which produces an astonishing assertion, a device seen already in the framing of the Golden Rule by 6:27-30, 32-33, 35, (also 11:20; 13:30; see below) appears as well as a major feature of the Confident Prayer instruction.

In the rhetorical questions of 11:11-12, the cluster returns to the mode of example and illustration from recurrent social obligations.¹¹⁹ Illustrative rhetorical questions in the penultimate position are found also in the Love Your Enemies and Judge Not clusters. The appeal made by these verses to analogy and social norms, as well as the rhetorical question format mark 11:11-12 as standard wisdom argumentation.¹²⁰ The father-son illustrations structurally and thematically correspond to the Friend at Midnight.¹²¹ Moreover, Berger notes that both example units are based upon a *reductio ad absurdum*.¹²² Verses 11-12 anchor the gnomic admonitions and audacious claims of 11:9-10 in God's paternal love. Correspondingly, they set up the cumulative assertion of God's provision in 11:13.¹²³ The manner in which the rhetorical questions of 11:11-12 both set up and combine with the assertion of verse 13, inclusive of the latter's vocative appeals, quite precisely replicates the arrangement of 6:41-42, the conclusion of the Judge Not cluster.

The encompassing framework units (11:2-4; 11:13) besides constituting the programmatic opening admonition and closing application to pray, supply a crucial divine reference point for the illustrations and central aphorisms (11:5-8, 9-10, 11-12) drawn from common scenes of human activity. Verse 13 serves as the specific application of the rhetorical question illustrations of 11:11-

¹¹⁸ See Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.217, Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 133-34, and Catchpole, "Friend at Midnight," 415, 418-19.

¹¹⁹ Piper, *Wisdom*, 18-19.

¹²⁰ Piper, *Wisdom*, 18; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.217; Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 14-15; see even Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 162-63.

¹²¹ Catchpole, "Friend at Midnight," 416.

¹²² Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 46-47; similarly Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.213.

¹²³ Piper, *Wisdom*, 17-18; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 162-63.

12 and cumulatively of the entire cluster.¹²⁴ Piper states that “assent to the general argument is carefully won before the specific application is made.”¹²⁵ Correspondingly, it translates the Friend at Midnight and the Child’s Request for Food, as well as the symbolic language of the central aphorisms, back into the specific admonition to prayer expressed at the outset.¹²⁶ Though formally an emphatic declarative sentence utilizing a *minore ad maius* argumentation, verse 13 functions as a call to prayer and in this respect forms an inclusio with the opening programmatic admonition and its model prayer. The inclusio is secured by the catchword Πάτερ...πατήρ and by the fact that τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν (11:13b) is the semantic equivalent to the opening προσεύχεσθε (11:2a).¹²⁷ The promise that God gives ἀγαθά stands in antithetical relationship to the clause in the prayer μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, the same elaborative combination that appears in James 1:13-17 (see also *Sir* 15:11-20).¹²⁸ The divine promise clause placed in the final position draws on a compositional technique widely attested in instructional speeches, in fact attested in virtually identical form in the Love Your Enemies cluster, which likewise concludes by invoking the paternal relationship with God. As in 6:35, so in 11:13 “der Vater ist hier als gütiger Schöpfer-Gott dargestellt.”¹²⁹ Q 6:42, the conclusion to the Judge Not speech, also contains a promise, “...then you will see clearly...”, though without an explicit divine reference. Finally, the pattern of placing human-centered demands in the central position, and flanking such by units with an implicit or explicit theological basis, is attested in *Sir* 15:11-20 (see also *Sextus* 67-72, 93-98).¹³⁰

¹²⁴ Noting the application function: Schenk, *Synopse*, 64; Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 133-34; Piper, *Wisdom*, 16, 19.

¹²⁵ Piper, *Wisdom*, 19. Piper’s compositional model hinders him from seeing the connection back to 11:2-4.

¹²⁶ Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 133-34, with respect to the foregoing verses 11-12.

¹²⁷ Sato, *Prophetie*, 39.

¹²⁸ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 159. See also Crossan, *In Fragments*, 98, and Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.217.

¹²⁹ Steinhauser, *Doppelildworte*, 78.

¹³⁰ A shift noted by Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 204, and Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 76.

Beelzebul Controversy (11:14-23)

Schürmann's account of the formation of this cluster posits that the chreia 11:15, 17 is the *Grundwort* to which 11:21-22 was added (*Zusatzwort*). About the same time verse 18a was attached ("zugewachsen") as an interpretation of the *Grundwort*, bringing the cluster essentially to the form it displays in Mark 3:22-27. Further development in the double tradition involved addition of the exorcism account in 11:14 (occurring in late stages, perhaps even in the final redaction of Q), and at around the same time 11:23 and 11:24-26 (Return of the Unclean Spirit) as a monitory conclusion (this combination itself being an earlier occurrence, with verse 23 added to verses 24-26 as a *Vorwort*), forming a framework with 11:14. However, at some previous point 11:19-20, containing the "christologische Hoheitswort," was inserted between 11:17-18a and 11:21-22, the primitive *Grundwort-Zusatzwort* combination, giving the latter "eine große Gewichtigkeit."¹³¹

One must ask if Schürmann is justified in breaking down the formation of the cluster into so many incremental growth stages. If Mark 3:22-29 can be taken as approximating the form of the tradition drawn on by a redactor, in actuality we could have just two formative stages before us, for the present Q text can just as easily be viewed as the product of a single compositional initiative. Conceiving of 11:24-26 as a framework addition occurring simultaneously with the expansion of the opening chreia to include an exorcism also creates problems, for as Schürmann acknowledges, the verses recounting the Return of the Unclean Spirit "eine großen Zusammenbruch des Siegeserfolges Jesu schildern," which had characterized the elaboration of the cluster up to 11:22.¹³² This indicates that the Beelzebul controversy might actually end with 11:23. Schürmann's remedy is to read the Return of the Unclean Spirit as a warning to baptismal candidates to whom this cluster is addressed, but there is no indication that the audience has shifted to insiders here, especially since 11:29ff. con-

¹³¹ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2. 238, 242, 246, 248, 252, 263-64; idem, "QLk 11,14-36 Kompositionsgeschichtlich befragt," in *The Four Gospels*, 1.563-86, esp. 572-74, 584.

¹³² Schürmann, "QLk 11,14-36," 573. Zeller, *Kommentar*, 60, suggests that verses 14-23 constitute a unified debate to which the Return of the Unclean Spirit was later linked "noch erst äußerlich" at the time of the final redaction of Q.

tinues to address hostile interlocutors. With the loss of 11:24-26 for understanding the formation of 11:14-23, Schürmann's assigning of the expansion of the opening chreia to a time simultaneous with the addition of 11:24-26 loses plausibility, making it possible to take the Q speech to be the result of fewer—perhaps only one—redactional initiatives.

Steinhauser proposes that 11:23 and 11:19-20 were (contrary to Schürmann's account) added ("hinzugewachsen") to the primitive tradition 11:15, 17 "in einer früheren Stufe der Tradition," and likewise contrary to Schürmann assigns 11:14 to the early form of the tradition. The criterion he uses is social-historical: 11:19-20, 23 "enthalten eine Zuspitzung des Gegensatzes zwischen Jesus und den Juden," with 11:18a and 11:21-22 also being added at this redaction-history stage. Verse 20 was probably crucial to the Q version of the pericope from its earliest stages, since it formulates a response to the accusation leveled in 11:15. Taken as a whole this redaction history is unconvincing because the witchcraft accusation leveled in 11:15 already attests to an extremely high level of tension. Steinhauser's analysis, however, corroborates the point made above: one needs to move just one step beyond the tradition as it is attested in Mark to arrive at the composition as it now stands in Q.¹³³

Rudolf Laufen describes 11:14-18a as the "ursprüngliche Kernstück der Perikope," and 11:19-23 as a "späterer Anhang," a position similar to Steinhauser's, though he bases his assessment on form-critical differences between the primitive "Streitgespräch" and the maxims, *Ich-Worte*, and *Bildworte* appended to it, as well as on the questionable assertion (in light of the function of 11:20) that in verses 20ff. there is no direct "Entgegnung" to the accusation of verse 15. Laufen concludes that the Q editor's intervention consisted of the insertion of 11:19-20 and the addition of 11:21-26 to the original chreia with the result that "die Antwort Jesu nun in eine lehrhafte Rede übergeht."¹³⁴

The opening of the cluster is clearly chreïc, and in fact in the well-attested form of a double chreia.¹³⁵ The opening chreia

¹³³ Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 141-47.

¹³⁴ Rudolf Laufen, *Die Doppelüberlieferung der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums*, BBB 54 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1980), 132, 147.

¹³⁵ The problem of the location of 11:16, "But others were seeking from

is "double" in two respects. First, Jesus takes a significant action to which the crowd responds with amazement (11:14), though this can also be seen as an apocoped exorcism and healing story. Second, "some" level a witchcraft accusation to which Jesus responds with an apt retort (11:15, 17).¹³⁶ A classic example of this type of chreia exchange is from *Theon*, 205, 9-19: "Alexander, the Macedonian king, stood over Diogenes as he slept and said: 'To sleep all night ill suits a counselor'; (*Il* 2.24). And Diogenes responded, 'On whom the folk rely, whose cares are many' (*Il* 2.25)."¹³⁷ Like this example, Q 11:14-15, 17 features an accusatory thrust followed by a swift, pithy riposte. Its conformity to this pattern suggests that these verses constitute the core chreia which has formed the starting point for the elaboration.¹³⁸ Viewing the speech on analogy with the chreia elaboration model sketched out by Hermogenes allows us to see Jesus' assertion in verse 17b, "Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and a house divided against itself will not stand," a "proverbial form of everyday wisdom about the disastrous results of dissension,"¹³⁹ filling the role of *programmatic general maxim* which forms

heaven a sign," which Luke has after 11:15, but which Matthew places before the Request for a Sign speech (Matthew 12:38), arises here. The IQP has opted, I think correctly, for the Lukan position (database and evaluation by Kloppenborg). For the pragmatic purpose of bringing out the chreia nature of both speeches I follow the Matthean arrangement, while affirming the likelihood that the collocation of themes in 11:14-16 is one of several means the Q editor uses to signal that the two controversy instructions are to be read together in macro-compositional terms.

¹³⁶ Vernon K. Robbins, "Rhetorical Composition and the Beelzebul Controversy," in *Patterns of Persuasion*, 161-93, esp. 186. See also Robbins, "The Chreia," 11, and Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 206, 208, who sees verses 14-15, 17 as the core chreia, and the entire Q cluster as an "erweitertes Apophthegma."

¹³⁷ See Robbins, "Beelzebul," 162-63.

¹³⁸ Michael Humphries, "Kingdom of God," notes the double-chreia structure of the opening (128). Utilizing the chreia elaboration pattern, Humphries argues that the Beelzebul controversy in its entirety, and extending through verses 24-26, is a carefully composed piece of argumentation (see esp. 122, 126).

¹³⁹ Humphries, "Kingdom of God," 130. Humphries tries to attach verse 18 to the programmatic general maxim of verse 17 (130-31), but it seems preferable to take verse 18 as the first in a series of specifying arguments, introduced by *ei*, culminating in verse 20. The rhetorical-question format shared with verse 19 also speaks in favor of aligning verse 18 with verses 19-20, the three forming a compositional unit. Humphries in fact states that verse 18a is a first deduction from the general rule stated in verse 17.

the starting point for the elaboration. Consistently with its programmatic function, Jesus' maxim "zwingt den Hörer oder Leser...die βασιλεία in Jesu Wort und Tat zu erkennen, und führt den Vorwurf...ad absurdum."¹⁴⁰ Taken alone, however, verse 17 only has potential to be exploited in this way, a potential actuated by the attached elaboration.

Robbins takes 11:17 to be the first argument in the elaboration and the hostile remark in verse 15 as the topic ("censure", "judicial charge").¹⁴¹ He is correct that verse 17 supplies the first counter-move to the censorious statement by the hostile interlocutors, but given the form-critical features of a double chreia, Jesus' retort constitutes the core assertion of the chreia. Robbins also underestimates the extent to which the argumentative maneuvers which follow take their thematic and key word references from Jesus' opening maxim while, to be sure, always keeping the opponents' charge in view. Though the accusation provides the pretext for this speech, it does not lay down the programmatic statement.

The evidence of Mark 3:24-27 indicates, however, that the Q redactor did not find the chreia in this stripped-down form but after it had already undergone an initial elaboration (if indeed it ever existed without this expansion) by the addition of the first specifying comment in 18a: "And if Satan is divided against himself, how will his kingdom stand?" (compare Mark 3:26), and by a version of the Strong Man analogy (Mark 3:27, compare Q 11:21-22).¹⁴² Though Mark's editorial interventions with respect to this unit can never be reconstructed with certainty, the judgment that verses 19 and 20 are Q's additions is sound.¹⁴³ Since verses 18a and 19 are rendered as rhetorical questions and thus replicate a pattern attested elsewhere in Q speeches (6:32-33;

¹⁴⁰ Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 146.

¹⁴¹ Robbins, "Beelzebul," 163-64.

¹⁴² Robbins, "Beelzebul," 163-64. See also Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 124, and Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.235.

¹⁴³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 124; Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 126. These additions are secured for Q by the fact that 11:19 has key word connections to the parallel Q cluster, 11:31-32, where Gentiles are the opponents' judges. The placement of "your sons" as judges of verse 19 reflects the placement of the men of Nineveh in 11:31-32: after a hostile request and an initial riposte by Jesus, a case of compositional parallelism which points towards Q redaction.

6:41-42; 6:44; 11:5-8, 11-12), it appears the editor has resorted to a preferred stylistic technique and along with the addition of the rhetorical question in verse 19 has modified the indicative statement of the tradition (verse 18a; compare Mark 3:26) to create this paired set of rhetorical questions. These then set up the climactic assertion of verse 20 (as do the paired rhetorical questions of the Love Your Enemies, Judge Not, and Confident Prayer speeches). Moreover, the rhetorical questions of 11:18, 19 narrow-down the meaning of the general, open-ended maxim of 11:17 by supplying concretizing illustrations.¹⁴⁴ At the same time they specify an application of the programmatic maxim to the issue at hand. The first attacks the premise of the accusation, while the second deflects the accusation back upon the heads of the accusers by creating a dilemma showing that the premise of their complaint would logically cast the net of accusation over "your sons."¹⁴⁵ Because verse 19 draws on the same argumentative logic as verse 18a—showing the weakness of the divided kingdom premise—it should be aligned particularly closely with that verse, for in verse 20 we encounter a fresh argument, a counter-assertion, and an abandonment of the rhetorical question structure, though the formal similarity (all conditional sentences) signals an encompassing argumentative unity.

Cicero states, "Every argument is refuted in one of these ways: either one or more of its assumptions are not granted, or if the assumptions are granted it is denied that a conclusion follows from them, or the form of argument is shown to be fallacious, or a strong argument is met by one equally strong or stronger" (*de Inventione* I.xlii.79). The final maneuver Cicero counsels appears in 11:20, which, Berger states, asserts an alternative explanation to that put forward by the opponents.¹⁴⁶ For their part, verses 18-19, along with verse 17, attack the premises of the opponents'

¹⁴⁴ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 33, calls verse 18a a "Bildwort"; Humphries, "Kingdom of God," 132, characterizes verse 19 as an "argument from example," which appeals "to a precedent established in the arena of history."

¹⁴⁵ Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, 86; Humphries, "Kingdom of God," 132-33; John J. Kilgallen, "The Return of the Unclean Spirit (Luke 11,24-26)," *Bib* 74 (1993) 45-59, esp. 49-50; Vaage, *Upstarts*, 60; Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 108; Ernst Käsemann, "Lukas 11,14-28," in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, Vol. 1, 6th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 242-48, esp. 243-44.

¹⁴⁶ Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 108.

witchcraft accusation. The unit thus is shown to be a sophisticated piece of forensic rhetoric.¹⁴⁷

As already suggested, 11:20 supplies the climactic conclusion to this exercise in counter-definition.¹⁴⁸ It answers the question of “whose kingdom?” raised implicitly in the accusation, explicitly in Jesus’ programmatic maxim (11:15, 17), and again in the rhetorical question of 11:18a. Verses 17-19, while exposing the accusation as false, leave the correct answer hanging in the air, and thus require the positive counter-assertion of 11:20.¹⁴⁹ As noted, a similar compositional pattern occurs in Q 6:32-35; 6:41-42; 6:44-45; 11:5-9; and 11:11-13.

This rhetorical development whereby a general maxim receives specification through two illustrative rhetorical questions leading to a climactic assertion follows fairly closely the elaborative pattern outlined by Piper.¹⁵⁰ The arguments are sapiential: each step appeals to the reason of the listeners, and divine sanctions (11:19b) are widely attested in instructional speeches. It is even possible to view verse 20 as forming an antithetical inclusio with the accusation in verse 15.¹⁵¹ What is lacking in 11:20, however, is a specific application of the instruction to the auditors as well as an inclusio with the programmatic maxim. If, however, one’s view widens to include 11:21-22 and 11:23, a pattern emerges quite similar to that observed in other Q clusters studied so far:

Programmatic Maxim (15, 17): But some said, “By Beelzebul...he casts out demons.”

But he...said to them, “Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and a house divided against itself will not stand.”

Rhetorical Questions (18, 19): “And if Satan is divided against himself, how will his kingdom stand? [For you say that I cast out demons by Beelzebul.] And if I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore they shall be your judges.”

¹⁴⁷ Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 108.

¹⁴⁸ On “counterdefinition” see Robbins, “Beelzebul,” 186.

¹⁴⁹ See Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.223-24, 236, Schenk, *Synopse*, 68, and Zeller, “Redactional Processes, 127.

¹⁵⁰ Piper, *Wisdom*, 122; see also Schenk, *Synopse*, 67.

¹⁵¹ See Horsley, “Q and Jesus,” 191, and Vaage, *Upstarts*, 60-61.

- Central Aphorism (20):* "But if by the finger of God I cast out demons, then upon you has come the Kingdom of God."
- Example (21-22):* "When the strong man, fully armed, guards his own palace, his possessions are in peace. But when one stronger than he conquers him, he takes away his armor in which he trusted, and divides his spoil."¹⁵²
- Final Maxim (23):* "The one who is not with me is against me, and the one who does not gather with me scatters."

Verse 20, which we can call the "central aphorism", or the "central pronouncement", constitutes the elaborative crux of the cluster.¹⁵³ Though it shares features and key words with the two preceding rhetorical questions and can be seen as the final member in a serialization of "if" statements, it is also distinguished from them in important ways. It displays a syntactic shift from rhetorical question to declarative format along with its introduction of a fresh argumentative maneuver. Moreover, in 11:20 Jesus first audaciously announces the unsurpassable, astonishing significance of himself and his actions (ἐγώ) in connection with a corresponding announcement of the arrival of the Kingdom of God, and thus startlingly answers the question of identity posed by the accusation leveled in the opening chreia (11:15; this replicates the rhetorical, compositional strategy of 7:18-23; 7:24-28; and 7:31-35; see below).¹⁵⁴ Schürmann aptly states, "Unverkennbar

¹⁵² Following the IQP's inclusion of this story in Q; see Michael Humphries' evaluation in *Documenta Q*.

¹⁵³ Humphries designates verse 20 the "proposition" ("Kingdom of God," 133, 140).

¹⁵⁴ Humphries argues that the point of 11:20 is not to claim special eschatological status for Jesus but rather is inclusivist—to include him among the other exorcists active within the boundaries of Israel and the kingdom of Yahweh. His argument is predicated upon the notion that Jesus cannot compare his exorcisms with those of other Jewish exorcists (11:19) and in the next breath claim that his exorcisms have special eschatological significance. Jesus is just attempting to clear up a misunderstanding. However, Paul Hollenbach points out that, given the very fact of the normative occurrence of other Jewish exorcisms, Jesus' exorcisms and healings could not have provoked the kind of deadly hostility giving rise to the witchcraft accusation of 11:14-17 had they not had attached to them a symbolic significance offensive enough to give rise to this bitter controversy. In effect, argues Hollenbach, in contrast to the routine exor-

wurde dieses Hoheitswort aber zum Höhe- und Mittelpunkt der ganzen Komposition...."¹⁵⁵

In addition to locating a christological assertion in the center of the arrangement (as in Q 6:40), the Q editor assigns 11:20 a coordinating function. On the one hand, it marks the end of the refutation of the opponents' accusation. On the other, it negotiates a shift from a defensive to the offensive posture assumed in the second half of the cluster (11:21-22, 23).¹⁵⁶ This development follows the forensic convention expressed by Quintilian: "For, if we are prosecuting, our first duty will be to prove our own case, our second to refute the arguments brought against it. *If, on the other hand, we are defending, we must begin by refutation*" (V.xiii.53; my emphasis). In a similar vein Cicero advises: "...then the case must be supported by proofs, which is effected by conjointly demolishing your opponent's arguments and establishing your own" (*de Oratore*, II.lxxxi.331). Finally, this central pronouncement mediates the radical shift from insinuation of alliance with Beelzebul in 11:15 to the outrageous demand for solidarity with Jesus in 11:23: while the central aphorism rebuts the opening accusation it also justifies the audaciousness of the closing demand, for in Jesus the kingdom has come, a state of affairs mandating immediate determination of allegiances.

The Overcoming of the Strong Man metaphorically describes an exorcism, with Satan presented as the vanquished Strong Man.¹⁵⁷ The parable sustains the exorcism *Leitmotif* of the clus-

cisms of "your sons", safely domesticated and assigned an innocuous niche within the existing social structure, Jesus made his healings manifestations of a far more comprehensive, revolutionary act of liberation, specifically, the arrival of the "kingdom of God" ("Jesus, Demoniacs, and Public Authorities: A Socio-Historical Study," *JAAR* 49 [1981] 567-88, esp. 582-83). Hollenbach is correct to appeal not just to 11:20, where this claim is made quite bluntly (and on the face of it resists reduction to Humphries' paraphrase: "the accused also represent the kingdom of God" [140]), but to the wider rhetorical context of Q, in particular the Mission Instruction, which has just preceded this controversy. Jesus' mentioning of other, uncontroversial exorcisms calls attention to the fact that his exorcisms give rise to conflict, and hence exposes the double standard of his interlocutors.

¹⁵⁵ Schürmann, "QLk 11, 14-36," 574; see also Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 209, and Käsemann, "Lukas," 243-44..

¹⁵⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 125; idem, "Social History," 92-93; similarly Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 192, Käsemann, "Lukas," 243-44, Humphries, "Kingdom of God," 133, and Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, 84.

¹⁵⁷ Graham H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*, WUNT 2/54 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1993), 112.

ter and rebuts the opening accusation by asserting Jesus' exorcisms to be an assault on Satan's kingdom. It also fulfills an illustrative function with respect to the assertions of the central aphorism and picks up the motif of conflicting kingdoms and rulers first colorfully depicted in 11:15, 17, 18a, 20.¹⁵⁸ The defeat of the opposing kingdom and its ruler is demonstrated in Jesus' exorcisms and illustrated in the parable.¹⁵⁹ The rhetorical questions (11:18-19) are not nearly so parabolic or metaphorical, yet both units invoke real or imagined situations to concretize Jesus' chreïc riposte and central pronouncement.

This brings us to 11:23, the final maxim—perhaps better termed an aphorism—which adapts a common proverb referring to the gathering or scattering of a herd.¹⁶⁰ The gnomic closure to the speech is conventional, as is the call to specific application and action. The aphorism functions both cumulatively and as an admonition: it appears at the end of an elaboration in which Jesus is demonstrated to be the agent of God's Kingdom; from this final position the aphorism demands a decision about allegiance to him in the light of the conflict of kingdoms depicted throughout the cluster. Schulz states, "Das zweigliedrige Schlußwort zwingt unüberhörbar zur Stellungnahme für oder wider diesen Endzeitpropheten, damit den christologischen und eschatologische Skopos dieser ganzen Streitrede summierend."¹⁶¹ This concluding call to personal action aligns the Beelzebul cluster with other Q instructions studied so far. Finally, the concluding

¹⁵⁸ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2. 243; idem, "QLk 11, 14-36," 572; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 125. Humphries characterizes 11:21-22 as an "analogy...drawn from the world of experience" ("Kingdom of God," 135).

¹⁵⁹ Polag, *Christologie*, 42; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.243; idem, "QLk 11, 14-36," 571; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 138, 148; Kilgallen, "Return of the Unclean Spirit," 49-50; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 124-25.

¹⁶⁰ von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 206; Käsemann, "Lukas," 245; see also Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 206, and Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 8-9.

¹⁶¹ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 212; see also Piper, *Wisdom*, 122, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 125-26, Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, 87, Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2. 247, and Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 184. Humphries argues that the repeated ἐμοῦ of the saying refers not to Jesus but to Satan, and that the saying thereby parallels the argument in verse 17 establishing that Satan's kingdom cannot act against itself and remain viable ("Kingdom of God," 136-38, following a suggestion by Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 108). However: (1) The cluster's pronominalization pattern has established Jesus as its referent (με...ἐγώ...ἐγώ); there is no justification here (ἐμοῦ...ἐμοῦ) for an irruption of this pattern which, moreover,

aphorism forms an inverse inclusio with the programmatic maxim. Verse 17 refers to a divided kingdom and house; verse 23 to undivided allegiance to Jesus; the opening image of division and fracture is replaced by a concluding call for solidarity.¹⁶²

Can this tense, confrontational speech be classified as an instruction? If one focuses on its form-critical characteristics, it quickly becomes clear that 11:14-23 conforms in all important respects to the instructional speech genre. The chreia which introduces it is a Hellenistic instructional form frequently used for sharp criticism. The speech takes its elaborative points of departure from (1) the accusation of witchcraft in 11:15 and (2) the *programmatic maxim* of 11:17. The body of argumentation which follows relies at least ostensibly upon appeals to reason and specifies, concretizes, and applies the general wisdom of the programmatic maxim while rebutting the opening accusation. Even the central Kingdom pronouncement (11:20) appeals to observation and depends for its validity upon arguments formulated in 11:17-19. The threat of judgment in 11:19b is not foreign to an instructional speech. The speech effects closure by deploying a maxim aphoristically appropriated by Jesus. Moreover, this final aphorism makes explicit the deliberative issue at the heart of this instructional speech. The sapiential topos of political cohesion and the folly of internal conflict is appropriated by Q for a deliberative speech demanding solidarity with Jesus, the inaugurator of the kingdom.

Request for a Sign (11:29-35)

Though Schulz characterizes this cluster (at least 11:29-32) as an expanded apophthegm, he attributes the connection of verses 31-32 with verses 29-30 to catchword association (γενεὰ αὐτή), and

would damage the cohesion and hence the coherence of the cluster. (2) The editor could easily have placed "Satan" in the slots occupied by emphatic ἐμοῦ, following the precedent established by the "Satan" maxim of verse 18. (3) It hardly seems rhetorically effective for Jesus, trying throughout this speech to evade a slanderous association with Satan, to suddenly act as Beelzebul's mouthpiece! (4) Humphries' attribution of verse 23 to Satan depends upon his prior assertion that in 11:20 Jesus does not make special claims for himself; we have seen above that his views on this point are contestable.

¹⁶² Käsemann, "Lukas," 245; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 164.

that in a "vorredaktionellen Traditionsstadium."¹⁶³ Schürmann breaks the cluster down into a series of primitive sayings-pairs. Verse 30 was added as a commentary to verse 29 to form one such pairing, and this before verses 31-32 were connected to verse 29, since verse 30's identification of the exalted Son of Man as the "sign" supposedly stands in tension with verses 31-32's designation of Jesus as being only a preacher of judgment. At the opposite end of the cluster, verse 33 is a *Grundwort* to which verses 34-35 were added as a *Zusatzwort* (and verse 36 as a *Nachwort*), a combination that took place at a later stage, since the "Licht-Finsternis Terminologie verrät wohl spätere paränetische Tradition...." The next step was the joining of verses 33-35 (36) (*Ansatzwort*) to verses 29-30 (*Grundwort*), for verse 30, referring to Jesus' resurrection from the dead, is better interpreted by verse 33, which urges that this sign be proclaimed to all the world, than by verses 31-32, for the reasons mentioned above. Insertion of the double-saying (verses 31-32) between verses 29-30 and verses 33-35 (36) constitutes the final step in the cluster's formation. This insertion is late because, first, the theme it articulates—threat of judgment because of (allegedly) Israel's rejection of the message—would arise rather late in the Q-community's social history, and, second, because the sayings which surround it (verses 29-30, 33-35) deal with the good news of the resurrection rather than judgment.¹⁶⁴

Schürmann makes decisions about the significance of sayings or sayings-pairs taken in hypothetical isolation and then creates a redaction history based on the hardly surprising clashes which arise when they are viewed in their present juxtapositions. For example, Schürmann takes the "sign of Jonah" (11:30) to be a reference to the resurrection and the lampstand proverb (11:33) as the community's proclamation of that sign to the world. Neither interpretation is self-evident, yet they provide the motif criteria by which Schürmann hypothecates a primitive juxtaposition of verses 29-30 with verses 33-35, which in turn leads to seeing

¹⁶³ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 253; see also Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 42.

¹⁶⁴ Schürmann, "QLk 11:14-36," 576-78; idem, *Lukasevangelium* 2.284-99; idem, "Son of Man Title," 83-84. An implicit theological history seems to lie behind this redaction history: (1) proclamation of resurrection, (2) rejection, (3) judgment.

verses 31-32 as a late interpolation clashing with the originally juxtaposed verses now flanking it.¹⁶⁵ Nor is it clear why the threat of judgment is a late introduction, especially since "this generation" is thematized both in verses 29-30 (itself a chreia depicting a confrontative situation) and in the alleged interpolation, verses 31-32. Moreover, one social-history criterion (threat of judgment against, allegedly, Israel, in 11:31-32) clashes with another ("light-darkness" dichotomy an indicator of late paraenesis, in 11:33-35), but with the latter nevertheless being assigned to an earlier tradition-history stage in order to enable a primitive connection with verses 29-30. Someone, using Schürmann's interpretive categories, could easily reverse his account by arguing that since verse 30 presents Jesus as exalted Son of Man, verses 31-32 as a messenger of wisdom, the latter are primitive, the former late. Lührmann, contrary to Schürmann, makes verse 30 (along with 29c) a component of the formative redaction under the rubric of the judgment threatened upon this generation, rather than a primitive *Zusatzwort* to verse 29.¹⁶⁶ Another conflict emerges from Schürmann's argument that the earlier juxtaposition of verses 29-30 with verses 33-36 refers to the Resurrection (verse 30) and its proclamation by the community (verses 33ff.), but then arguing that the light-darkness imagery of the latter is a paraenetic theme apposite to "Taufe" and "Bußzucht."¹⁶⁷

In the absence of literary-critical controls, irreconcilable tradition-history accounts of the formation of this cluster proliferate. Wanke, for example, reads verses 31-32 as "an early commentary" on verses 29-30.¹⁶⁸ Like Schürmann, he "assumes that ref-

¹⁶⁵ The preaching in this case has sign status; see Christopher M. Tuckett, "Mark and Q," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, 149-75, esp. 160.

¹⁶⁶ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 34-43, 99. Schürmann rejects this alternative by pointing out that "threatening speeches to Israel can also be found along with the judgment in the early layers of the tradition," as Lührmann himself acknowledges ("Son of Man Title," 84, see also note 57; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 101). But this is problematic for Schürmann's own proposal, for his labelling of verses 31-32 a late interpolation is predicated upon the motif of judgment being a late-comer in tradition-history terms, a response to the failure of the post-Easter proclamation to Israel (*Lukasevangelium* 2.289-90).

¹⁶⁷ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.299. It should be pointed out after all this that Schürmann agrees "daß 11,29-32, 33-36 als Einheit verstanden und ausgelegt werden will."

¹⁶⁸ Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 220-21.

erence to the son of man is somehow self-evidently antecedent to reflection on Jesus as a preacher of judgment."¹⁶⁹ Jacobson comes up with an account similar to Schürmann's, but takes verse 30 as a prophetic warning appended to verse 29, later enlarged by the addition of verses 31-32 which "expands the judgment of 'this generation'."¹⁷⁰ But one could argue equally well that the theme of warning or judgment, on Jacobson's own telling a factor in appending verse 30 and (later) verses 31-32, is a redactional motif linking all three in a synchronic composition, for Jacobson is hardly justified in separating verses 29-30 from 31-32 when both reflect the same motif, especially since he acknowledges that the denial of the sign (verses 29-30) is punitive. His sole criterion for redaction-history separation is that verses 29-30 still seem to offer "this generation" a chance to repent, a grace allegedly absent in verses 31-32, but this depends upon reading verses 29-30 apart from their juxtaposition with verses 31-32. Zeller suggests that verses 31-32 were attached to verses 29-30 because of the catchword "Jonah," and that the juxtaposition took place "bei der Sammlung der Logien."¹⁷¹ Vaage argues that verses 31-32 were appended originally to verse 29, with the *πλεῖον* of the Jonah-Solomon saying corresponding to the *σημεῖον* of verse 29, both references to the earthly Jesus, and that it is verse 30 with its reference to the future and celestial Son of Man which is the later insertion.¹⁷²

If thematic and social-history considerations are bracketed, it immediately springs to view that 11:29-30 forms an aphorism + motive or rationale clause combination corresponding to the conventional opening of instructional speeches (or to the enthymematic opening of a piece of deliberative rhetoric). Adjoining 11:16 to this aphorism, as Matthew has it, creates a chreic context for this opening and suggests that the cluster 11:29-35 may incorporate features of a chreia elaboration. Verse 29 is an enigmatic aphorism using highly charged symbolic language in need of fur-

¹⁶⁹ Vaage, "Son of Man Sayings," 117.

¹⁷⁰ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 70-71, 165-66.

¹⁷¹ Dieter Zeller, "Entrückung zur Ankunft als Menschensohn (Lk 13,34f; 11,29f)," in *À Cause de l'Évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O. S. B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire*, LD 123 (Paris: Cerf, 1985), 513-30, esp. 526.

¹⁷² Vaage, "Son of Man Sayings," 116-17.

ther explication. Verse 30 functions in just such a manner, translating the enigmatic aphorism into an arguable proposition.¹⁷³ Though 11:30 remains allusive, the comparison of Jesus to Jonah articulates the thesis that Jesus' preaching is a sufficient sign which, moreover, ought to bring about repentance.¹⁷⁴ The units which follow in 11:31-35 elaborate this thesis. Because 11:30 (the Son of Man saying) has this crucial function with respect to the composition of the cluster, its present position is likely due to the Q editor, as Lührmann argued, though it certainly functions as more than a "redaktionelle Klammer."¹⁷⁵

The compositional shape of this elaboration is as follows:

Chreia Aphorism (16, 29): [But others were seeking a sign from heaven.] But he said, "This generation is an evil generation; it seeks a sign, but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah."

Rationale (30): "For as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites, so also shall the son of man be to this generation."

Examples (31-32): "The queen of the south will be raised at the judgment with this generation and will condemn it; for she came from the ends of the earth to listen to the wisdom of Solomon, and behold, something greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here."

¹⁷³ Robbins, "Beelzebul," 189, notes the similarity verses 29-30 bear to the opening of a chreia elaboration, but his designation of verse 29 as the thesis is open to question, since it is so enigmatic it cannot function as a thesis until translated into less veiled language. Several other scholars have taken stock of the explicative relationship of 11:30 to 11:29, though without linking it to the conventions of deliberative or instructional rhetoric; see Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.283, Sato, *Prophetie*, 282, Zeller, "Entrückung," 521, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 130.

¹⁷⁴ See Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 192.

¹⁷⁵ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 41; see also Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Son of Man Sayings in the Sayings Source," in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.*, eds. Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 369-89, esp. 378.

Central Gnome (33): "No one lights a lamp and puts it under a basket, but on a lampstand, and it gives light to all in the house.¹⁷⁶

Example (34): "The lamp of the body is the eye; when your eye is sound, your whole body is bright; but when your eye is bad, your whole body is dark.

Concluding Aphorism (35): "If, then, the light in you is darkness, how great is the darkness!"

Verses 29-35 in their entirety constitute a unified composition with a configuration resembling that of other Q instructions.¹⁷⁷ Like the other instructions the Request for a Sign adduces illustrative, concretizing material immediately after programmatic statements standing at the head of the speech. Verses 31-32 supply authoritative scriptural examples which explicate the significance of the programmatic thesis, explaining why this generation is an "evil generation," why its demand is so deviant as to justify refusal, and in what sense "Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites," which in turn explains in what sense the "Son of Man" is a sign "to this generation." Verses 31-32 can be classified as examples incorporating, even featuring, a threat of judgment.¹⁷⁸ Schenk describes them as "Beispiele aus der weisheitlich gedeuteten alttestamentlichen Geschichte...an die Adresse der Ablehnenden als Drohworte gerichtet," and Lührmann as a "weisheitliche Lehrerzäh-

¹⁷⁶ The IQP is reluctant to finish the text after "lampstand" because of the disagreements between Matthew and Luke. I have supplied Matthew's final clause, following Steinhauser's opinion, *Doppelbildworte*, 358, that "Demgegenüber [Luke] setzt die mattäische Fassung das palästinische Bauernhaus mit einem Raum voraus, was sicher auf die ältere Fassung hinweist."

¹⁷⁷ Against particularly those scholars who argue that there is no connection between the Request for a Sign (11:29-32) and the Lamp-Body instruction (11:33-35), for instance, Williams, "Parable and Chreia," 100; Sato, *Prophetie*, 40; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 180. A median position is adopted by Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 140, who notes that the connection of the two halves is not confirmed by Matthew and that "der gedankliche Zusammenhang ist sehr lose"; similarly Ferdinand Hahn, "Die Worte vom Licht Lk 11,33-36," in *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker*, ed. Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1973), 107-38, esp. 132-34, who, because they have their own their own compositional and thematic integrity, sees verses 33-36 as a separate unit, which nevertheless supplies christological comment to verses 29-32 and thus may have been composed simultaneously.

¹⁷⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 128; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.286; Sato, *Prophetie*, 150.

lung.”¹⁷⁹ As seen in the last chapter, threats of divine judgment are not foreign to instructional speeches, but regularly appear as components of the motivational apparatus. It is thus incorrect to read into 11:31-32 a rejection of Israel as Lührmann and Schürmann suppose.¹⁸⁰ The examples pointedly refer Jesus’ skeptical interlocutors to other ancient auditors—Sheba and the Ninevites—who responded quite differently to wise, authoritative words. The positive response of the queen and the Ninevites, combined with the threat of judgment, serve as inducements to Jesus’ auditors, intractable though they may be, to act likewise. The reference to Jonah transports them to the place of the Ninevites—standing under the shadow of imminent judgment, yet with a final opportunity to repent.¹⁸¹

Though the examples of the queen and the Ninevites retain a studied ambiguity, the twin references to the σοφία of Solomon and the μετανοεῖν at the κήρυγμα of Jonah explicate the alternative offer of the “sign of Jonah” and the “sign” of the Son of Man made in the programmatic opening as being the repentance preaching of Jesus and the wonderful events associated with his appearance.¹⁸² The πλεῖον than Jonah or Solomon thus may signal an intentional correspondence to the σημεῖον demanded by the opponents.¹⁸³ “This generation’s” inexcusable failure to properly appraise these as much more obvious manifestations of God’s presence than even Solomon’s proverbial wisdom or Jonah’s miraculous appearance and preaching justifies the opening aphorism’s refusal of a further sign as well as the threat of judgment.¹⁸⁴

The smooth shift from the opening programmatic statements

¹⁷⁹ Schenk, *Synopse*, 71; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 39.

¹⁸⁰ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 42; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.269.

¹⁸¹ Sato, *Prophetie*, 283.

¹⁸² Some scholars, frequently by virtue of an isolated interpretation of 11:30, argue that the “sign of the Son of Man” refers to a future judgment appearance, taking ἔσται as indicating this eschatological event and linking it with remote Q-contexts such as 13:34-35 and 17:24-37, overlooking the reference of the immediate context to the μετανοεῖν at the κήρυγμα of Jonah; see Bultmann, *History*, 118, Tödt, *Son of Man*, 53-54, Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 40-42, Schenk, *Synopse*, 72, Zeller, *Kommentar*, 63, and idem, “Entrückung,” 520-25.

¹⁸³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 128; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 273.

¹⁸⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 128, points out that verses 31-32 focus on *responses* to preaching; see also Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 38, and Tuckett, “Mark and Q,” 159-60.

to the examples of verses 31-32 manifests the familiar movement from general saying or admonition to increasing specificity and applicability. The opening aphorism is extremely enigmatic (“mehrddeutige Rätselwort”), but receives an initial decoding and specification from the supportive aphorism appended in verse 30 (“konkretisierend aufschlüsselt”), in its turn explicated by the twin examples of the queen of the south and the Ninevites (“zusätzlich...verdeutlicht”).¹⁸⁵

The lamp on the lampstand saying (11:33) is located in the heart of the speech.¹⁸⁶ This gnome has a coordinating function, for it picks up the themes elaborated in the first half of the cluster and enunciates the theme to be developed in the second half. The image of the light picks up the reference to a sign, that is, a visible manifestation, from the beginning of the speech. This σημεῖον, revised by Jesus into the self-referential πλεῖον in 11:31-32, is now translated into a sight-metaphor, λύχνον, thus cumulatively absorbing the opening request for a visible sign and subsequent explication of the true sign as being Jesus’ preaching and wisdom. It also sustains an “acoustic echo,” easily heard in any oral performance, augmenting the cohesiveness of the speech.¹⁸⁷ Verse 33 articulates the central argument of the speech with gnomic succinctness, suggesting as it does that Jesus’ ministry is an adequately illuminating sign.¹⁸⁸ It functions instructionally, for the light imagery of the gnome and the reasonableness of its argument—people light lamps for illumination, not, nonsensically, to conceal the light—suggest to the interlocutors that their demand for a sign from heaven is misguided since the light is shining before their eyes. Accordingly the saying encourages reflection upon the possibility that Jesus is the light, particularly in view of the thinly veiled self-references in 11:31-32.

The light on the lampstand saying moves the composition for-

¹⁸⁵ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.269.

¹⁸⁶ On the gnomic character of 11:33 see Hahn, “Worte vom Licht,” 112, Winton, *Proverbs of Jesus*, 35, and Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.296.

¹⁸⁷ On “acoustic echoes” see Havelock, “Oral Composition,” 183.

¹⁸⁸ Scholars pointing out that 11:33 gnominically absorbs the arguments of verses 29-32 include Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 370, 376-77, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 138, Hahn, “Worte vom Licht,” 132, Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.384, idem, “Son of Man Title,” 83, Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 182, Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, 92, and Robbins, “Beelzebul,” 190.

ward into its second half, for it supplies the maxim elaborated and applied by 11:34-35. The first clause of 11:34 is also gnomic, for it offers a folk-science observation on the function of the eye in relation to the interior of the body.¹⁸⁹ Its instructional persuasiveness comes from its capacity to link the verities of folk-science to the moral issue under discussion. Its appearance here immediately following the general maxim of 11:33 conforms to the compositional procedure described by Piper whereby a supporting maxim is appended to a general maxim as the first step in focusing the latter's significance upon a specific instructional situation. This saying initiates a short explanation in which the various states of the body are described with respect to the soundness (ἀπλοῦς) or "badness" (πονηρός) of the organ of sight (bright or dark respectively), and thus (similarly to 6:43-45) moves the discussion from the metaphorical toward a specific application in the moral realm.¹⁹⁰

Thus, taken as a whole, 11:34 is a self-contained illustrative unit with a concretizing function, specifying and beginning to apply to the human realm the general maxim of 11:33.¹⁹¹ The move from the metaphorical space of 11:33 into the human moral realm (already anticipated in 11:33 by the mention of "all in the house" upon whom the light shines) is accomplished, first, by the introduction of the human eye as the organ which transmits light into the human body. Concurrently this maneuver draws a line from the lamp of 11:33 to the human eye of 11:34. This line is somewhat ragged because the lamp image is now assigned to the eye's function; however, the relationship between the light and people on whom it shines is, as noted, already present in 11:33. Second, the light shining in the room of 11:33 becomes in 11:34 the inner space of the human illuminated by the lamp of the eye.¹⁹² Hence verse 34 shifts attention from the lamp shin-

¹⁸⁹ Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 6-7, classifies it as a "folk proverb"; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 206, as a "bildhafte anthropologische Sentenz"; Ian Henderson, "Gnomic Quatrains in the Gospels: An Experiment in Genre-Definition," *NTS* 37 (1991) 481-98, esp. 485, labels it "proverbial science"; Betz, *Commentary*, 450, as a "proverb".

¹⁹⁰ Betz, *Commentary*, 441, 450-51.

¹⁹¹ Hahn, "Worte vom Licht," 115. Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.300, observes that the imagery of verse 34 is not dependent on its context, though the context, especially verse 35, gives it its application (through τὸ φῶς ἐν σοί).

¹⁹² Schürmann, "QLk 11, 14-36," 577; idem, *Lukasevangelium* 2.300.

ing in the house to the issue of the health or dysfunction of the human organ of sight, and from the well-lit room to the relative inner light or darkness of people. It thus moves from a christological focus on the light itself to "its subjective appropriation."¹⁹³ It also makes explicit the hortative function of the speech by invoking second person address. Since both ἀπλοῦς and πονηρός are morally evaluative terms, deployment of them in this example suggests that the "bright" (φωτεινόν) and "dark" (σκοτεινόν) states of the body are descriptions of the moral disposition of the person.¹⁹⁴ Within the context of this instruction, 11:34 describes two types of person, one who is able to perceive the light of Jesus and is morally whole, and one who is not able to see the light of Jesus and is morally deficient.¹⁹⁵

At this point the thematic correspondence between the two illustrative units, 11:31-32 and 11:34, becomes clear: both describe two contrasting classes of persons, one able to perceive (queen of the south, Ninevites), another blind ("this generation"), and both units deal with subjective appropriation (of wisdom, of light). Thus 11:34 elaborates on 11:31-32: the reason "this generation" fails to grasp the significance of the message which is so much "more" than the wisdom of Solomon and the preaching of Jonah is because of its defective moral disposition.¹⁹⁶ This connection is secured by the repetition of the key word πονηρός used in the programmatic statements at the beginning of the cluster to describe "this generation."

Like the Judge Not and Prayer instructions, this cluster concludes with a direct moral application (11:35). Verses 33-35 replicate the pattern of the latter half of the Prayer instruction (11:9-13) which enacts the sequence of a general maxim, followed by a two-part illustrative unit, concluded by an exclamatory appli-

¹⁹³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 135, 138.

¹⁹⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 136; Betz, *Commentary*, 450-53; Susan R. Garrett, "'Lest the Light in You be Darkness': Luke 11:33-36 and the Question of a Commitment," *JBL* 110 (1991) 93-105, esp. 95-96, 100, 102, who notes that in *Wis* 1:1-2, those who put God to the test (as here), are described as not having ἀπλότης καρδίας.

¹⁹⁵ Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 370; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 174, who also notes the immediate juxtaposition of the Woes, which allege graphically the moral rottenness of this group and refer directly to the "inside" (11:39b-40, 44).

¹⁹⁶ See Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 377, and Piper, *Wisdom*, 129.

cation introduced by εἰ οὖν.¹⁹⁷ Though the aphoristic 11:35 lacks the imperative necessary to make it a direct admonition, it has monitory force, sounding a warning of mortal danger if the light of Jesus is not received.¹⁹⁸

The recurrence of πονηρός in 11:34c signals an inclusio with the γενεὰ πονηρά of verse 29. The final aphorism (11:35) also alludes back to the programmatic statements of 11:29-30, though with different nomenclature: in 11:29 Jesus refuses a visual sign to his interlocutors but assures them, enigmatically, of another; in 11:35 he warns them of the darkness that threatens them because a defective moral disposition prevents them from perceiving the light shining before their eyes. The closing admonition contains more than a hint of irony when seen in relation to the opening request for a sign. Jesus' challengers in 11:16, 29 consider themselves morally qualified to test Jesus' legitimacy by demanding a sign; Jesus turns tables by suggesting in no uncertain terms that they are morally incapable of the kind of perception necessary to make such a determination. They assume the honor of a religiously supervisory position, but Jesus' speech shames them with ridicule by depicting them as peering about for a sign (11:16, 29) when the light is shining right in front of them as clearly as a lamp on a lampstand (11:33). This in turn leads to the charge that the light in them is darkness (11:35).¹⁹⁹ At the outset the challengers demand a sign, presuming upon their own capacity to see; in the end, Jesus disqualifies them because of visual-moral impairment.

¹⁹⁷ See Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 469, and Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.296. Henderson, "Gnomic Quatrains," esp. 482, 485, 493-94, labels verses 34-35 a "gnomic quatrain," a genre which begins with a gnomic sentence (in this case 34a) which is then taken to a paradoxical conclusion (verse 35, the inward light may in fact be darkness) via an intervening double explanatory saying (verse 34bc). The appearance of a longer form, which places a general maxim in front of a supportive maxim, elsewhere in Q suggests that the quatrain could appear alone (as in Q 16:13), or embedded in more complex compositions.

¹⁹⁸ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.298; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 374, 377; Robbins, "Beelzebul," 190; Betz, *Commentary*, 453; Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, 93; Hahn, "Worte vom Licht," 108; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 138; see also Schenk, *Synopse*, 73-74. Piper, *Wisdom*, 129, and Garrett, "'Lest the Light in You be Darkness,'" 101, suggest that a call to commitment can be inferred from the absolute contrast the concluding aphorism sets up between the moral realms of light and darkness.

¹⁹⁹ Robbins, "Beelzebul," 190.

Similar images (and similarly laughable) exploiting the motif of impaired vision and linking it to moral dysfunction are featured in the Judge Not cluster. Both 6:41-42 and 11:33-34, identically placed in their respective clusters, utilize images portraying dysfunctions of the organ of sight. The central saying of the Judge Not cluster, 6:40, like 11:33 obliquely refers to Jesus and is flanked by comparisons featuring eyes, blindness, claims to moral supervision, and failures of perception. Surrounded by blind moral guides, the true sage sits in the center of the Judge Not speech. Surrounded by a blind "this generation", the lamp shines out of the center of the Request for a Sign speech. Both clusters have in view a group claiming moral leadership and the right to pass judgment, but whose qualifications for that position are challenged by Jesus.²⁰⁰

Despite the confrontational tone of this speech, it remains instructional. Even the final admonition with its threat of darkness is stated conditionally. Verse 34 is a bona fide attempt to explain to this group its diseased moral disposition. To these who wish to see a sign Jesus presents himself as the light.

Courageous Witness (12:2-12)

The intriguing configuration of this cluster has attracted quite a bit of redaction-history analysis. Schürmann argues that it formed around the kernel composition 12:4-7 through a series of additions. Verses 8-9 were appended to the end of this unit and verse 2-3 attached to its beginning. Verse 10, a second Son of Man ending, was then added to the first Son of Man ending (12:8-9), serving as a supplementary clarification that denial of the Son of Man may indeed be forgiven if it occurred before the Easter proclamation. Verses 11-12 were either appended at the same time by virtue of an earlier connection with verse 10 or else added after verse 10 was attached to verses 8-9.²⁰¹ Schürmann describes this process so elliptically that his redaction-critical justifications are often obscure. It can be said, however, that he extends into several redactional stages compositional events

²⁰⁰ Kloppenborg's assigning of these speeches to separate strata is unlikely in view of these shared redactional features.

²⁰¹ Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 85-87.

which could just as conceivably have occurred either simultaneously or within a shorter compass, as Schürmann himself at times comes close to conceding. For example, he puts forth three different scenarios for the formation of verses 4-12. He suggests that 12:11-12 is a later addition to 12:10 after the appending of the latter to 12:8-9 which had earlier been added to 12:4-7. Alternatively he suggests that 12:10 and 12:11-12 themselves formed a short sayings-group before being added to 12:8-9. Finally, he allows that 12:8-9 could be seen as a *Grundwort* with 12:10 as its *Zusatzwort*, and 12:11-12 as a *Nachwort*, and that this whole formation might at one redaction-history moment have been appended to the kernel composition 12:4-7 after 12:2-3 had already been attached to it, with 12:11-12 echoing the opening 12:2-3, both referring to bold proclamation. However, this convenient correspondence would had to have been pure luck, since verses 12:11-12 were allegedly appended to 12:10 at an earlier stage before such an excellent correspondence could come into view. Such multi-stage explanations do not render a convincing account of the formation of this cluster. One could with equal justification argue that 12:2-3, 8-12 were simultaneously added fore and aft to 12:4-7.²⁰²

Similarly to Schürmann, Piper sees 12:4-7 as a core composition which expanded to the proportions of the present Q cluster by the addition of 12:2-3, 8-9 (Piper does not take 12:10, 11-12 into consideration because of Matthew's different placement).²⁰³ Though framed by admonitions not to fear, the non-threatening, non-eschatological wisdom argumentation of 12:4-7 supposedly sets it apart from the more intense anxiety evident in 12:8-9 and the eschatological viewpoints of 12:8-9 and 12:2-3. Further, Piper claims, 12:8-9 bring the new composition to a specific application, thus replicating an elaborative pattern attested elsewhere.²⁰⁴ Despite the enhancement of this redaction history by application of literary-critical criteria, several uncertainties remain. Piper's analysis does not account for 12:10-12, and the fact that Matthew places these units differently is not sufficient

²⁰² See Collins, "Son of Man Sayings," 379.

²⁰³ Piper, *Wisdom*, 222, note 229. Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 51, also considers 12:8-9 to be the "Abschluß" of the composition.

²⁰⁴ Piper, *Wisdom*, 52-58.

pretext for excluding them from the analysis. Bringing them in, even provisionally, deprives 12:8-9 of the concluding application role assigned to it and of its *inclusio* function vis à vis 12:2-3. This would force a significant reassessment of the composition of the cluster. It is also not clear that the eschatological flavoring of the framework units is sufficient pretext to posit a redaction history, especially since the admonition in 12:5 to fear the one able to cast into Gehenna arguably features both a warning and an allusion to judgment. Piper himself acknowledges that the thematic differences may not be adequate to support the suggested redaction history.²⁰⁵ The present text, Piper notes, makes a unified statement about “fearlessness in one’s adherence to the Christian proclamation in the face of opposition....”²⁰⁶

Kloppenborg proposes that 12:8-9, 10 were interpolated into a primitive wisdom composition consisting of 12:2-7, 11-12. While acknowledging the presence of catchword connections between 12:10 and 12:11-12 (ἅγιον πνεῦμα) and that the interpolated unit presumes a forensic setting similar to that of the early composition, he concludes that the differences between the two units are more decisive: the primitive composition is characterized by second-person plural imperatives, a hortatory and comforting tone, insider audience (community), implied situation of persecution, and shared function to encourage fearless preaching; 12:8-10 by contrast is directed at outsiders who reject the preaching and consists of a sentence of holy law and a prophetic threat. Similarities in catchword and implied forensic setting served to ease the interpolation of the unit.²⁰⁷ Kloppenborg’s analysis improves upon Schürmann’s by its greater economy, its appeal to literary-critical criteria to differentiate units, and its capacity to integrate the analysis into a proposed redactional strategy (announcement of judgment) encompassing all of Q. Whether all these criteria are of equal value is another matter; for instance, the appearance of sanction and threat does not *prima facie* constitute a genre-clash since instructions frequently incorporate threats of sanction.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁵ Piper, *Wisdom*, 65-66.

²⁰⁶ Piper, *Wisdom*, 60.

²⁰⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 214; idem, “Antique Instructional Genres,” 147-48.

²⁰⁸ Sato, *Prophetie*, 41, suggests an early composition made up of 12:4-12

The opening unit (12:2-3) exhibits the sequence general maxim + aphoristic admonition, familiar as a threshold structure for wisdom speeches.²⁰⁹ For these reasons it is better to see the unit as composed from 12:2-3 forwards to the end, rather than as expanding outwards through successive accretions from 12:4-7, a procedure which tends to make 12:2-3 an addition and thus misconstrues its programmatic threshold function and its concomitant functions (1) to signal the instructional genre of the speech, and (2) to absorb into the instructional speech the various constituent micro-genres which follow.

The opening maxim (12:2) is a gnomic saying in wide circulation whose application to varied contexts attests to its hermeneutical openness.²¹⁰ The admonition which follows (12:3) may be a hortative formulation of an independently circulating gnomic saying or a specifying hortatory derivative of the opening maxim. In either case both units feature a basic division between things hidden and things revealed.²¹¹ In their present juxtaposition the two sayings form a symbiotic hermeneutical relationship, with 12:3 narrowing the opening maxim's range of application to the public witness of (in all likelihood) the disciples.²¹² Verse 3 takes the general maxim of verse 2 to a first level of concretion, setting forth the programmatic theme of the cluster: bold and coura-

with "Fürchtet euch nicht" in verse 4 and "Sorget euch nicht" in verse 11 forming an admonitory framework, with a *Sitz im Leben* in persecution. To this was added 12:2-3 and 12:22-31, "wobei der Gesichtspunkt die Schwierigkeiten der besitzlosen, wandernden Verkündiger sind." Zeller, *Kommentar*, 72-75, sees the cluster as "ein Beispiel für eine Stichwortkomposition" (72), unified around the topic of martyrdom.

²⁰⁹ Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q," *HTR* 80 (1987) 287-306, esp. 292, states, "...wisdom is set in the eschatological context of the manifestation of the kingdom and conversely, the coming or presence of the kingdom is expressed by means of sapiential logic."

²¹⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 206; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 206; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 49-50; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 156-58; C. E. Carlston, "Wisdom and Eschatology in Q" in *Logia*, 101-19, esp. 99; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 132.

²¹¹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 206-207; Piper, *Wisdom*, 57; Williams, "Parable and Chreia," 91-92; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 462; Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 8-9; Sato, *Prophetie*, 144; Dieter Zeller, "Weisheitliche Überlieferung in der Predigt Jesu," in *Religiöse Grunderfahrungen: Quellen und Gestalten*, ed. Walter Strolz (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1977), 94-111, esp. 102; Henderson, "Gnomic Quatrains," 488, note 28; Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 222.

²¹² See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 210, Hahn, "Worte vom Licht," 120, Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 50-51, and Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 464.

geous revelatory speech.²¹³ By virtue of this and its commanding threshold position, 12:3 in conjunction with 12:2 becomes the programmatic admonition of the speech. It mandates that revelation to which the group is privy be openly proclaimed in a still unspecified public forum. The opening maxim's divine passives serve to put the human proclamation urged in the programmatic admonition and the supportive imperatives which follow under the constraint of divine inevitability and eschatological necessity. The disciples' public speech becomes a channel of divine revelation in the last days; in fact, their open proclamation of things previously hidden inaugurates the decisive revelation of the end.²¹⁴ The opening maxim locates the chaotic, fearful, and life-threatening circumstances in which this proclamation is destined to be delivered reassuringly in the ineluctably unfolding will of God.²¹⁵

Verses 4-7 constitute a self-contained instruction consisting of two imperatives, each followed by a brief rationale, in turn followed by two illustrations, one about sparrows and another about hair being numbered, concluded by a final admonition incorporating an *a minore ad maius* argument in the service of a direct application. The final admonition forms an inclusio or framework with the opening admonition.²¹⁶ The inclusio (μὴ φοβεῖσθε... μὴ φοβεῖσθε) demarcates 12:4-7 as a discrete literary unit within the longer cluster, but it also joins together what appear to be two heterogeneous, almost thematically antithetical units—verses 4-5 and verses 6-7. The first unit bases its appeal upon the pun-

²¹³ Piper, *Wisdom*, 58; Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 222. Henderson, "Gnomic Quatrains," 487, notes that 12:3 intensifies and personalizes the opening maxim.

²¹⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 210-11, who notes that all attested occurrences of the maxim are in the context of divine activity; also idem, "Symbolic Eschatology," 292, and idem, "Antique Instructional Genres," 147, 151. See also Zeller, "Weisheitliche Überlieferung," 102, Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 159-60, 164, and Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 223. In fact, 12:2 can be justifiably described as the programmatic, inaugurative maxim for the entire final section of Q extending to 22:28-30, where the Son of Man sets up his kingdom and Q group is revealed as the elect eschatological community (see below, chapter four).

²¹⁵ Kloppenborg, "Social History," 38; idem, "The Q Sayings on Anxiety (Q 12:2-7)," *Forum* 5/2 (1989) 83-98, esp. 85.

²¹⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 208, who notes the resemblance with 6:27-31, 33-35; 11:9-13; 12:22-31; see also idem, "Q Sayings on Anxiety," 91, Piper, *Wisdom*, 55-56, Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 160, and Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 50.

ishing power of God, whereas the second appeals to God's providential care.²¹⁷ These units are bound together because both, though in different ways, motivate the hearer or reader to fear God. In their present juxtaposition, whereby verses 4-5 precede and thus infuse their content into verses 6-7, both motivate the hearer to fear God instead of human authorities, even those vested with powers of capital punishment.²¹⁸ In the same vein, the "falling sparrow" alludes to the death of the body held out as a possibility in 12:4, motifs which in turn integrate this double unit into the concerns of the larger composition. The admonition, "Do not fear those who kill the body," indeed appears in *4 Macc* 14:15 in a martyrdom setting where faithfulness, courage, and bold proclamation before authorities are, as here, the profiled virtues.

In this respect verses 4-7 further concretize the opening maxim and programmatic admonition: the public forum in which open proclamation is to take place is a court with capital powers of coercion. Because martyrdom is a real possibility, an instructional speech which commands courageous witness supplemented by tough motivational units is necessary in order to counteract the danger of apostasy which inheres in such a situation.²¹⁹ This includes adducing the threat of judgment (12:5b). In a kind of *a minore ad maius* argument, fear of committal to Gehenna is aroused to encourage courageous witness in the face of bodily suffering and death.²²⁰ As we have noted frequently, threat of divine sanction is a conventional element of instructional speeches, but conventional or not, this is a sharp prod indeed, and the wound is immediately salved with images which assure of God's tender and provident care (12:5-7).

The unit from start to finish conducts a conventional wisdom argument, using *a minore ad maius* arguments, illustrations from daily life, sanctions, and appeal to the providence of the Creator

²¹⁷ See Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 95-96, and Kloppenborg, "Q Sayings on Anxiety" (also *Formation*, 207), who notes the thematic clash of the two units and suggests a secondary juxtaposition based on a common imperative, "Fear not" (92-93).

²¹⁸ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 187.

²¹⁹ Kloppenborg, "Q Sayings On Anxiety," 90; idem, *Formation*, 209; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 101; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 161; Piper, *Wisdom*, 53.

²²⁰ Edwards, *Theology*, 120; see also Hoffmann, *Studien*, 328.

God.²²¹ Von Lips notes that "behavior before authorities" is a topos of wisdom literature (citing *Slav. Enoch* 39:8, Prov 16:14; *Sir* 8:1; 13:11-13; Qoh 10:4, to which we could add *Any* 9:6-10).²²² These traditional instructions counsel strategies of self-preservation in the face of a hostile ruler. Zeller notes that Q 12:4-7 contorts this traditional wisdom: bodily preservation is scorned for the sake of a greater preservation.²²³ Many of the conventional instructions advise quietness and calmness to placate an angry ruler; in Q we have an admonition to bold and surely provocative proclamation.

Like 6:43-45, the Courageous Witness instruction lacks the stylistic feature of a central saying, though the next unit, 12:8-9, contains an "explicit christological focus" ("...acknowledge/deny me in public..."),²²⁴ as do the central sayings of the Judge Not, Beelzebul, and Request for a Sign clusters.

Verses 8-10 taken together consist of a contrasting double unit just as do verses 4-7. They continue to specify the opening maxim's and programmatic admonition's range of application. Accordingly, in these units we find an increasing abandonment of figurative, allusive language in favor of greater explicitness. It brings the hearer or reader right into the court proceedings and puts him or her in the position of the confessor standing ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.²²⁵ It reveals the issue at stake in these public proceedings to be confession or denial of Jesus, and Catchpole demonstrates by comparison with *4 Macc* 10:15 and *2 Macc* 6:6; 7:37 that the language of confession and denial is apposite to a martyrdom setting.²²⁶ Finally, it introduces another actor in the revelatory unfolding of the end promised by the programmatic maxim (12:2), namely, the Son of Man.

The structural oppositions set up in 12:4-7 reappear in 12:8-9, 10. Like 12:4-7, 12:8-9, 10 contrast an earthly judgment scene

²²¹ Piper, *Wisdom*, 55, 183; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 208, 210.

²²² Von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 218.

²²³ Zeller, "Weisheitliche Überlieferung," 104-105.

²²⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 211.

²²⁵ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 72, notes that ἔμπροσθεν is a fixed expression for standing before judges.

²²⁶ David R. Catchpole, "The Angelic Son of Man in Luke 12:8," *NovT* 24 (1982) 255-65, esp. 258; see also Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 188; Piper, *Wisdom*, 58; Horsley, "Wisdom Justified," 745.

before human judges with a heavenly judgment scene before a divine judge and similarly deploy the argument that it is much better to be condemned by the human court but approved at the divine court than vice versa.²²⁷ Like verses 4-7, verses 8-9, 10 strike a balance between threat and consoling promise, the difference being that the former do it in the contrast of juxtaposed units, the latter within the parallelism of the verses themselves.²²⁸ As in verses 4-5, the threat of judgment in verses 8-9 is directed at group members (differently verse 10, see below) and functions conventionally to motivate obedience to the programmatic admonition to public witness by spelling out the grave consequences of public apostasy.²²⁹ The other occurrences of the saying in Mark 8:38, Luke 9:26, 2 Clem 3:2, 2 Tim 2:11-13, and Rev 3:5 are likewise directed toward insiders.

The relationship of 12:10 with 12:8-9 is a critical problem of long standing, for while verses 8-9 make denial of Jesus (whom Q identifies with the Son of Man) decisive for condemnation, verse 10 states that rejection of the Son of Man is forgivable while rejection of the Holy Spirit is not.²³⁰ The most popular solution takes verse 10 as an explanation or correction of verses 8-9: the latter refers to the period of Jesus' earthly proclamation, while verse 10 refers to the era of the disciples' proclamation in which is offered a second chance at acceptance which if rejected brings the irrevocable condemnation initially attached to rejection of Jesus' earthly proclamation.²³¹ However, this solution,

²²⁷ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 72, notes the correlation between the earthly and heavenly courts in verses 8-9; similarly Zeller, *Kommentar*, 76.

²²⁸ Piper, *Wisdom*, 59; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 160; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 328; also Catchpole, "Angelic Son of Man," 264-65.

²²⁹ Piper, *Wisdom*, 61; Horsley, "Wisdom Justified," 745; idem, "Q and Jesus," 194; idem, "Logoi Propheton," 203 (who does not, however, make a connection to the opening admonition); John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991), 248. As was the case with verses 4-5, the appearance of a prophetic or apocalyptic threat does not necessarily create the relatively high degree of tension with the surrounding sapiential idiom which Kloppenborg estimates (*Formation*, 211; see also Schenk, *Synopse*, 86 ["Rechtsätze urchristlicher Propheten"], Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 69, and Sato, *Prophetie*, 275, who analyzes this as "einen prophetischen Doppelspruch der 'bedingten Heils- und Unheilsankündigung'...").

²³⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 212; Vaage, "Son of Man Sayings," 118.

²³¹ For example, Tödt, *Son of Man*, 119; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 152; Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 224; Polag, *Christologie*, 163; Schürmann, "Son of Man

while perhaps intelligible as an explanation of tradition-history provenances, allows the contradiction to stand, or assumes that readers and hearers are able to supply rather sophisticated salvation-history commentary to two sayings.²³²

The fact that wisdom compositions from time to time deliberately juxtapose apparently contradictory sayings in order to cultivate the capacity to determine the situational "fittingness" of the contrasting proverbs points a way out of the problem.²³³ When the two units are seen respectively as apposite to two different situations and referents, the contradiction evaporates. Verses 8-9 are directed toward group members and invoke the threat of divine sanction to motivate them to lay down a courageous public witness even when their lives are at stake. Verse 10 is directed toward outsiders, more particularly, toward the hostile judges and threatens them with condemnation if they reject the charismatic witness of those standing before them.²³⁴ The faithful witnesses in *4 Maccabees* also address bold warnings of perdition directly to the oppressing authority. Moreover, Q has already identified a group of outsiders hostile to Jesus (11:14-23; 29-35) and capable of killing prophets (11:48-51; 13:34). Therefore, 12:10 aptly describes them as those who speak against the Son of Man while verse 10b holds out to them a final possibility of forgive-

Title," 86; Sato, *Prophetic*, 277; see Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 212-13, for a comprehensive survey of opinion.

²³² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 213.

²³³ van Leeuwen, *Context and Meaning*, 103, referring to Prov 26:4-5; Whybray, *Composition*, 74-75. Williams, *Those Who Ponder Proverbs*, 37-38, draws attention to this phenomenon in Sirach. Another example is found in *Syr. Men.* 340-346. It begins with: "Do not measure your strength with one who is stronger than you/ or one who forces you to strive with him;/ do not say to yourself, 'Maybe I will cast him down,'/ lest he cast you down;/ then you will be ashamed in the presence of many bystanders." But suddenly the instruction shifts its tone: "Be bold against one who contends with you;/ and do not forgive him the revilements against your father." The reader is forced to consider the different situations in which each of the apparently contradictory counsels may have applicability.

²³⁴ See Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 120-21; idem, *Kommentar*, 77. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 213, agrees that 12:10 is directed toward outsiders and constitutes a warning to heed the inspired utterance of the sect members before the tribunal. However, because he has construed 12:8-9 as also directed towards outsiders, the tension between the two units remains. Kloppenborg adopts a complex solution whereby the significance of verse 10a is played down (similarly Sato, *Prophetic*, 134).

ness of past obstinacy and of avoiding judgment if they heed the Spirit-inspired witness of Jesus' followers.

A problem immediately arises, however, if 12:10 is directed toward outsiders, for such seems intrusive in an instruction urging group members to lay down a courageous public witness.²³⁵ In effect, however, verse 10 functions as motivation to *insiders* to obey the programmatic admonition, for it attributes to their bold confession cosmic, charismatic power of life and death for those who hear it. Accordingly it links the proceedings of the human court in which the witness is delivered to the exponentially more significant—and apparently imminent—judgment court of mythic proportions featuring the Son of Man. In this manner 12:10 cleverly inverts the relations established by the earthly, hostile court, for it transforms the martyrs from defendants into judges and the judges into defendants. An identical turning of tables is a feature of Philostratus' description of the trial of Apollonius of Tyana before Domitian, "...when he left the court after convicting the tyrant rather than being himself convicted..." (*Life of Apollonius* VII.1).²³⁶ Not only is the Q disciple's utterance a divine oracle, but it creates a cosmic nexus in which earth and heaven, present and future, condemnation, judgment, and salvation intersect. It would be hard to invent a more effective motivation to obey the programmatic admonition. So while 12:10 is ostensibly directed at outsiders, within this instruction it functions as a motivation for insiders.²³⁷ Thus there is no real change of audience in 12:10 on the scale of a rupture calling for redaction-history resolution. The saying tells the disciples that their coerced witness in the hostile court is in truth a charismatically endowed

²³⁵ The preamble to Hesiod's *Works and Days*, however, switches back and forth between address to Perses and to corrupt aristocratic judges; see lines 105, 202, 248.

²³⁶ Similarly, in the case of Apollonius and Domitian there is the real possibility of death for the sage, though he ultimately is acquitted; moreover, the tale profiles the *courage* of Apollonius in this situation and his *bold speech*. See Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, translated by F. C. Conybeare, LCL (1960), VII.1; VII.31-33; VIII.1-5, 11.

²³⁷ To this it could be added that it is not unusual, if infrequent, for an instructional speech to suddenly shift stances and address some hostile outside entity. See *Ps.-Phoc.* 42-47 and *Sir* 2:1-17, esp. vv. 12-14. Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 85, states, "In lebhafter Stilisierung kann also auch einmal eine Weisheitsspruch Negativtypen unmittelbar ansprechen, wobei aber die Auseinandersetzung immer schon exemplarisch geführt ist."

divine oracle signifying salvation or perdition for those upon whose ears it falls.

The instruction closes with an admonition accompanied by a promise clause (12:11-12). This unit could itself constitute a mini-instruction of the situational type, in as much as it opens by describing a likely recurring situation (ὅταν δὲ...), and then gives a specific instruction for coping with that situation along with a promise clause, which also functions as a motive and rationale for the main admonition. In its present context, however, this unit supplies to the longer speech the closing admonition and direct application as well as forming an inclusio with the opening admonition (12:2-3). Both 12:2-3 and 12:11-12 envision a public forum for proclamation. The opening maxim + admonition links bold public proclamation (verse 3) with the revelatory work of God (verse 2); in a similar manner verses 11-12 make the courageous proclamation of the disciple a divinely inspired manifestation. If we are correct that the opening maxim invokes the unfolding of end time events, verses 11-12 make tribulations experienced by the group a manifestation of the end time and its public proclamation revelation.²³⁸ The closing admonition is cumulative with respect to the foregoing instruction. As noted it recapitulates 12:2-3, but with its reference to anxiety and explicit mention of public confession in official proceedings it also absorbs and places in a fully concrete context the themes articulated in verses 4-10. "Those who kill the body," "the one who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit" are now identified as "the rulers and the authorities"; "every one who acknowledges me in public" is now identified as "you."²³⁹ Like 12:6-7 the final unit functions as a word of consolation.²⁴⁰ By throwing off all metaphorical and mythical language and speaking plainly about the actual forensic situation, 12:11-12 concludes a graduated movement from general, allusive speech to specific application.²⁴¹

Taken as a whole, 12:2-12 exhorts to courage. By so doing treats in its own way a topos of Hellenistic gnomological literature which was frequently organized around the four cardinal

²³⁸ Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 159-60, 164-65.

²³⁹ See Richard Horsley, "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q," in *Conflict and Invention*, 42-59, esp. 51, on the authorities in view here.

²⁴⁰ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 443.

²⁴¹ See Sato, *Prophetie*, 213.

but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven.

Final Admonition (11): When they bring you before synagogues, do not be anxious how or what you are to say;
Promise Motive Clause (12) for [the Holy Spirit] will teach you in that hour what you are to say.

Do not be Anxious (12:22-31)

Schürmann takes 12:29a, 30b-31 to be the *Grundwort* of this cluster, the kernel from which it expanded to its present proportions.²⁴⁴ Zeller proposes a three-stage redaction history which recognizes the tight thematic cohesion of the cluster and does not try to tease out redactional layers on the basis of subtle distinctions. Verses 22, 24, 27-29, 30b were brought together to form the initial cluster and “wohl gleichzeitig” verses 25, 26a. A Jewish-Christian community inserted the unfavorable comparison to Gentiles in verse 30a, and the addition of verse 22a integrated the speech into “eine Sammlung von Q-Logien.” The final step—the addition of the kingdom saying of 12:31—gave the previously conventional wisdom argumentation an eschatological conclusion.²⁴⁵ Zeller thus uses the notion of a generic distinction between wisdom and eschatology and the appearance of ζητεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν, previously unattested in Jewish wisdom, to plot 12:31 later on the redactional time-line, but one could object that if a later editor thought an eschatological conclusion appropriate to a wisdom elaboration, an earlier editor could have as well.

Hoffmann argues that Luke has transposed verses 33-34, which originally stood *before* 12:22-31. The primitive dominical cluster, consisting of verses 22, 24, 27-28, 29-30, was directed at the poor in the hope of liberating them from chronic dispiriting anxiety and helping them cope with subsistence existence by putting in mind the providential love of the Creator God. However, when verses 34-35 were attached to the front of this simple wisdom elaboration (as part of a Q redaction, directed by eschatological interests, which created macro connections among small groups), the editor felt that the alternatives set forth in the “Trea-

²⁴⁴ Schürmann, “Zeugnis der Redenquelle,” 159.

²⁴⁵ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 87, 90-91.

tures" sayings needed further explication and so added the kingdom saying (12:31) to the other end of the cluster, thus creating a positive alternative to the negative commands of the early cluster. Since the same editorial strategy was driven subjectively by deeper reflection upon human existence and its relation to the Kingdom, 12:23, 25 were added at the same time, as well as 12:30a. This redaction narrowed the audience from the poor in general (Jesus' audience) to wandering missionaries leading a radical existence wholly for the sake of the Kingdom of God. Hoffmann's redaction history thus traces the reception and particularization of Jesus' primitive message.²⁴⁶ This is an engaging reconstruction, locating as it does Jesus' primitive message among the poor, but one dependent upon an (albeit plausible) social-history reconstruction of the subsequent development of early Christianity, as well as upon the separation of wisdom from eschatology. The present form of the text functions as a relatively thin veil through which one can view previous settings and textual configurations of the cluster. In the absence of literary-critical criteria which might help configure earlier forms of the text, it is hard to know how the proposal might be verified.

Catchpole argues that the earliest cluster consisted of verses 22a, 24, 27-28, 29, 30b, a composition replicating a pattern of opening admonition, two illustrative arguments, and summarizing admonition, attested elsewhere in *Q*, though here as elsewhere distorted by subsequent redaction. This early composition, functioning in an enthusiastic environment, encouraged detachment from everyday concerns in view of the Kingdom's imminent arrival. In the course of time redactional interventions occurred in response to waning enthusiasm and resurgent worries for subsistence. Verses 23, 25, 28b, 30a, and 31 were then interpolated to buttress the original argumentation, but with their insertion the coherence of the primitive compositional pattern was disturbed.²⁴⁷ Catchpole's proposal raises a number of ques-

²⁴⁶ Hoffmann, "Jesu 'Verbot des Sorgens'," esp. 125-27.

²⁴⁷ David R. Catchpole, "The ravens, the lilies, and the *Q* hypothesis. A form-critical perspective on the source-critical problem," *SNTU* 6-7 (1981-82) 77-87, esp. 83; idem, "Law and the Prophets," 99. In these earlier articles Catchpole designated 12:31 part of the original composition; however, he has since argued instead that it is redactional because of a "shift of language from μεριμνῶν to (ἐπι)ζητεῖν..." and because verse 31b "duplicates" verse 30b ("Q, Prayer, and the Kingdom," 378-79).

tions. Adducing a compositional pattern attested elsewhere to act as a literary-critical template for discerning intrusions is an important methodological initiative, but the attestational base is restricted to Q, and in fact both here and in other Q passages Catchpole must posit later redactional distortions to retrieve the primitive pattern.²⁴⁸ To add plausibility Catchpole aligns the materials of the cluster along a social history trajectory which posits an early enthusiasm subsequently dampened by delay in the arrival of the Kingdom. However, it is not clear that this social history is not itself a factor in sorting out the materials rather than merely describing social-history implications of a redaction history satisfactorily determined on other grounds. Moreover, Catchpole damages even its apparent applicability by his later reversal and allocation of 12:31 to redaction, thus removing from the primitive cluster any reference to enthusiastic expectation of the Kingdom.²⁴⁹ This reversal itself demonstrates the fragility of reconstructions of primitive coherencies based on thematic and social-history criteria, for in the first version of the argument verse 31 is a coherent conclusion based on one such set of considerations (it expresses the enthusiastic expectation of the imminent kingdom), whereas in the second version it is a redactional intrusion based on another set (it revitalizes disciples dispirited by the delay).²⁵⁰

Taken in its present form, the Do Not Be Anxious cluster exhibits the following structure:

Programmatic Admonition (22): Therefore I tell you, do not be anxious (μὴ μεριμνᾶτε) about your life, what you shall eat, nor about your body, what you shall put on.

Motive, Rationale (23): Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothing?

Example (24): Look at the ravens; they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet God feeds them. Are you not of more value than the birds?

Central gnomic saying (25): And who of you by being anxious

²⁴⁸ See above the discussion of Q 11:2-13.

²⁴⁹ See Catchpole, "Q, Prayer, and the Kingdom," 378.

²⁵⁰ Catchpole, "Ravens, lilies," 87; idem, "Q, Prayer, and the Kingdom," 379.

(μεριμνῶν) is able to add to his span of life a cubit?

Example (26-28):

And why are you anxious about clothing? Consider the lilies, how they grow; they neither toil nor spin; yet I tell you, even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if the grass in the field, which is there today and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, God clothes thus, will he not much more clothe you, O you of little faith?

Concluding Admonition (29):

Therefore do not be anxious (μὴ μεριμνήσητε) saying, What shall we eat? or What shall we drink? or What shall we wear?

Motive Clauses (30):

For the Gentiles seek all these things; for your Father knows that you need them.

Admonition and Promise (31):

But seek his kingdom, and these things shall be yours as well.

This arrangement conforms closely to that of Q 6:27-35; 6:37-42; 11:2-13; 11:14-23; 11:29-35. The only significant difference is the additional admonition and promise clause at the end.

Verses 22-23 supply a conventional programmatic opening to the instruction, in this case in the form of admonition + motive or rationale. The opening admonition has maxim-like properties and makes a general observation about human behavior.²⁵¹ The motive expresses a maxim in the form of a rhetorical question.²⁵² These threshold units articulate the themes which the body of the instruction takes up and elaborates in turn: first food (12:24),

²⁵¹ Betz, *Commentary*, 461, 471. Betz notes that the entire composition, with its dialogical properties, resembles a diatribe (466).

²⁵² Zeller, *Mahnprüche*, 83; idem, *Kommentar*, 79; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 212. Catchpole, "Ravens, lilies," 79, and Hoffmann, "Verbot des Sorgens," 117, argue that verse 23 stands in tension to verse 22 because the latter urges not to worry about one's life, the former that life is more than food and drink. This distinction is overly subtle and fails to appraise the fact that the supplementary phrases in verse 22, "what you shall eat...what you shall put on," clarify what is meant by worrying about one's life: concern about subsistence. Verse 23 continues in this course while at the same time taking the argument to a new level: human life is more than frantic grasping after food and clothing, thus demonstrating the wisdom of the opening admonition.

then clothing (12:26-28).²⁵³ Moreover the opening admonition (or prohibition) expresses the key word which is repeated throughout the composition: *μεριμνᾶτε*.²⁵⁴ Both are features of the homily pattern discussed by Borgen and Stegner, in which a programmatic scriptural quotation is divided and discussed in sequence, with its key word or key words distributed throughout the composition.²⁵⁵ Mack demonstrates the affinities of this opening with the thesis + rationale opening statements in Greek deliberative rhetoric.²⁵⁶ The main deviation from this pattern is found in the "rationale" (verse 23), which, as Mack notes, is itself aphoristic and somewhat enigmatic. Mack points out that the very enigma of 12:23—leaving undefined just what the "more" of life may be—"provides the opening for further deliberation."²⁵⁷ Together, therefore, verses 22-23 make an open-ended statement which the rest of the composition will unfold and bring to specific application.

The ravens illustration which follows likewise conforms to conventional wisdom argumentation, which frequently supports programmatic admonitions with analogies taken from the natural world.²⁵⁸ In a wisdom manner it concludes with an *a minore ad maius* argument framed as a rhetorical question bringing home the point of the illustration for human life.²⁵⁹ The ravens illustration rationally supports the programmatic admonition not to be anxious for basic necessities, for it demonstrates the provident care of God for his creatures observable in the daily course of nature.²⁶⁰

²⁵³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 218; Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 61; Zeller, *Mahnspprüche*, 82; Betz, *Commentary*, 460-61.

²⁵⁴ Zeller, *Mahnspprüche*, 83, noting its recurrence in verses 25, 26, 29.

²⁵⁵ Peder Borgen, *Bread From Heaven. An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. Supplements to NovT 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 34-35; William Richard Stegner, "The Ancient Jewish Synagogue Homily," in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*, ed. David E. Aune, SBLSPS 21 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 51-69.

²⁵⁶ Mack, *Rhetoric*, 51; see also Douglas, "Family, Power, Religion," 177-82.

²⁵⁷ Mack, *Rhetoric*, 51. Q 12:3, in precisely the same position as 12:23 relative to its cluster (12:2-12), has the same ambiance: it makes a programmatic statement, but somewhat enigmatically; the opacity is cleared up by the elaborative units which follow.

²⁵⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 217; Zeller, *Mahnspprüche*, 84-85.

²⁵⁹ Zeller, *Mahnspprüche*, 84; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 207.

²⁶⁰ Piper, *Wisdom*, 28; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 155, note 131. In 11:2-13 an il-

Verse 25 is a gnomic saying framed as a rhetorical question. Its focus, the shortness of human life, is a highly recurrent motif in sapiential reflection, treated in the light of the sapiential axiom that “Gott hat des Menschen Tage fest bestimmt und ihm so eine Grenze gesetzt, die er nicht überschreiten kann.”²⁶¹ This particular performance of the gnome makes its appeal in the form of a *reductio ad absurdum* argument.²⁶²

Despite its appositeness to the programmatic admonition, even reproducing the key word *μεριμνῶν*, and the high recurrence in sapiential discourse of the motif it expresses, many scholars have labeled 12:25 intrusive, assuming because of the similarity of the Ravens and Lilies analogies that they must have been juxtaposed at an earlier stage of the text. This reconstruction is predicated upon the fallacious assumption, rooted in *Kleinliteratur* conceptions, that catchwords or formal similarity indicate primitive contiguity; hence “restoration” of contiguity supposedly gives access to early stages of the text. Some scholars allege, however, that the present position of the gnome between the parables constitutes a distracting interruption of a unified argument.²⁶³ Against this view the following points and parallels should be emphasized:

lustration from daily life demonstrating provision of food, functioning to assure of divine providence, and similarly framed as a rhetorical question occupies precisely the same position within the composition (11:5-8, Friend at Midnight).

²⁶¹ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 89; similarly Berger, “Hellenistische Gattungen,” 1052, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 219, and Perdue, “Wisdom Sayings,” 15-16. Examples similar to 12:25 include *Sentences of Sextus* 255: τὸ γὰρ ζῆν μὲν οὐκ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν, καλῶς δὲ ζῆν καὶ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν [“For we cannot control the length of life, but we can control whether we live properly.”]. See also Qoh 1:15b (“...what is lacking cannot be counted”); 6:12; 8:7-8; Psalm 39:4-6; *Ps.-Phoc.* 114, “We humans live no long time, but only briefly”; *Sir* 30:24; Job 14:5.

²⁶² See Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 46, and Mack, *Rhetoric*, 52.

²⁶³ Catchpole, “Q, Prayer, and the Kingdom,” 378; idem, “Ravens, lilies,” 80; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 217; Hoffmann, “Verbot des Sorgens,” 117; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 152, 154; Sato, *Prophetie*, 218, note 334; Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 60; Piper, *Wisdom*, 28-29. Piper argues that “it is no longer a matter of the basic necessities of life, but of the very future of one’s life itself. In this way, it also differs significantly from the question posed in Mt 6:25b.” This distinction, if it exists at all, is too thin to support the redaction history erected upon it. Moreover, the connection between life itself and the subsistence elements necessary to sustain life is drawn in the juxtaposition of verse 23 with verse 22. Betz analyzes verse 25 in terms of its synchronic relationship with other parts of the cluster, though he tends to reduce it to a concluding element of the “ravens” argument on analogy with 12:28b (*Commentary*, 472, 478), even though 12:28b is analogous to 12:24c, not to 12:25.

(1) The appearance of gnomes anywhere within instructional speeches was seen in chapter two to be one of the most typical features of the genre (see, for example, Epistle 21 of *The Epistles of Socrates and the Socratics*).

(2) Food, drink, anxiety, and length of life constitute a *recurring motif configuration* in sapiential literature. Zeller notes that in the sapiential tradition, anxiety about food and clothing is often taken as having a shortening effect on one's life.²⁶⁴ *Sir* 30:24-25 states, "Jealousy and anger shorten life, and anxiety brings on premature old age. Those who are cheerful and merry at table, will benefit from their food." *Syr. Men.* 385-396 reads:

Let anxieties never dominate your heart
because it is a bad thing to nurse anxiety.
For many are the years which a man does not (really) live;
their anxieties (slowly) kill him.
If you are anxious, you shall die;
and if you are sad, you shall never (really) live.
*For short and limited is the space of life
which God determines for men;*
and he mingled for them many bad things with a few good things.
The main source of all good things is the fear of God,
it delivers (one) from all evil things;
a treasure it is.

Like Q 12:22-31 this speech opens with the admonition, "Let anxieties never dominate your heart." In the middle of this instruction occurs a gnome (391-92) strikingly similar to Q 12:25, and like the Q cluster emphasis is placed on God as the source of good things.

(3) In a similar vein, the sequence 12:24, 25, 26-28 resembles the configuration of the instruction on "due measure" in *Golden Verses* 32-38, the center of which is occupied by a general admonition to live "a pure way of life," (εἰθίζου δὲ δίαίταν ἔχειν καθάρετον) flanked on one side by a specific, concretizing admonition to practice "due measure in drinking, eating, and physical exercises," and on the other side by a similarly specifying admonition to exercise moderation in expenditure of wealth.²⁶⁵

²⁶⁴ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 89 (referring to *Sir* 30:21-24; 33:13b; 34:1f; 38:18f; *Papyrus Insinger* 17).

²⁶⁵ See the discussion of this cluster in chapter 2. *Sentences of Sextus* 255 con-

(4) The technique of placing a gnomic saying which discusses some aspect of human activity between illustrative units which depict the beneficial activities of God (human-centered flanked by theological) is attested in the Q 11:2-13 (Confident Prayer), and outside of Q in *Sir* 15:11-20.²⁶⁶

(5) Far from being an interruption of an argument, the gnome of verse 25 connects seamlessly backward and forward to both nature analogies. As Zeller notes, the parable of the ravens deals with food and therefore about survival, leading him, like Betz, to construe the gnome as the parable's concluding *Begründung*.²⁶⁷ Sapiential reflection likened the *brevity of human life* to the *brief life of the grass of the field*, so in this respect the gnome connects forward to the flower and grass analogy which follows in 12:26-28.²⁶⁸ Moreover, by its allusion to mortality, verse 25 creates a peak of intensification vis à vis the concerns for food and clothing which flank it and by so doing demonstrates with finality the futility of human anxiety.²⁶⁹ It impels the listeners or readers to devote themselves to the something "more" alluded to enigmatically in 12:23.

(6) As these points in #5 already indicate, verse 25 has a coordinating function within the composition; moreover, it prominently displays the *Leitwort* of the cluster, also located at the cluster's beginning and end (μὴ μεριμνᾶτε [12:22]...μεριμνῶν [12:25]... μὴ μεριμνήσητε [12:29]).

Verses 26 is a resumptive rhetorical question which invokes the second half of the programmatic admonition (12:22b) while simultaneously shifting the elaboration toward the parable of the lilies.²⁷⁰ Though Mack splits the parable into three argumentative units, making 12:27a an "analogy," 12:27b a "paradigm,"

figures the same motifs, though more elliptically: "For we cannot control the length of life, but we can control whether we live properly."

²⁶⁶ See above, chapter 2.

²⁶⁷ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 83; Betz, *Commentary*, 472, 478.

²⁶⁸ See, for example, Ps 37:2; 90:5-6; 102:11; 103:15-16; Isa 40:6-8. See also Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 86, and Richard J. Dillon, "Ravens, Lilies, and the Kingdom of God (Matthew 6,25-33/Luke 12:22-31)," *CBQ* 53 (1991) 605-27, esp. 612, who takes 12:25 as an introduction to the parable of the lilies.

²⁶⁹ Zeller, "Weishheitliche Überlieferung," 98-99: "Der kritische Punkt, an dem alles Besorgen versagt, ist der Tod. Er offenbart die *Ohnmacht der menschlichen Anstrengung*...."

²⁷⁰ Resumptive or reiterative elements in the middle of instructional speeches is a compositional technique as old as the Egyptian instructions.

and 12:28 an “analogy,”²⁷¹ it is clear that form-critically it is a single unit. “Grass” and “lilies,” though not interchangeable, are nevertheless related as varieties of plant life growing in the fields. The parable displays a declination from the coordination of “lilies” with “Solomon” to “grass” with “you.” The shift to “grass” intensifies the *a minore ad maius* potency of the argument, for it shows God’s care for the lowliest, most common, most unremarkable genera of plant life, the grasses of the field (compare 12:6-7: sparrows and hair). A concluding rhetorical question, incorporating a mild paedagogical scolding expressed vocatively (12:28b), drives home the point of the parable.²⁷² The formal similarities of the Lilies and Ravens units are so obvious as to hardly need comment: both are nature analogies, both incorporate *a minore ad maius* arguments, both refer to God’s care, both are expressed as rhetorical questions (compare 11:5-8; 11:11-12, like 12:24, 26-28 connected by a gnome, 11:9-10). The second is significantly longer than the first, a feature Tannehill attributes to concern to create a rhetorical climax, beginning with a short parable in relatively gentle language, culminating in a longer parable featuring forceful, extravagant language.²⁷³

The concluding admonition with its two motive clauses (12:29-30) forms an inclusio with the opening admonition.²⁷⁴ However, like many instructions, it paraphrases the opening admonition, expressing the concerns for adequate nourishment and covering as though quoting an anxious listener.²⁷⁵ The appending of two motive clauses (12:30) is anything but odd; ancient instructions frequently attach two, three, or even four motive clauses to a

²⁷¹ Mack, *Rhetoric*, 51.

²⁷² Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 85. Instructions readily admit scoldings and reproaches on a wide scale of intensity and harshness and, as Zeller points out, their purpose is paedagogical (see also Bernhard Lang, *Wisdom and the Book of Proverbs: A Hebrew Goddess Redefined* [New York: Pilgrim, 1986], 1-45). Catchpole, “Q, Prayer, and the Kingdom,” 378, is thus excessively sensitive to this change of tone when he labels it redactional because it allegedly “imports an element of rebuke which does not fit the reassuring and encouraging tone of the rest of the pre-Q tradition.”

²⁷³ Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 63-65.

²⁷⁴ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 83; Mack, *Rhetoric*, 51; Catchpole, “Ravens, lilies,” 81; Hoffmann, “Verbot des Sorgens,” 117; Piper, *Wisdom*, 31.

²⁷⁵ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 85-86, designates this technique as “Stil des weisheitlichen Mahnspruches, der oft die Rede als Symptom tieferliegender Haltungen korrigiert.”

single admonition. Nor is the introduction of the “Gentiles” motif intrusive.²⁷⁶ It sets up a negative example illustrating behavior opposite that counseled by the instruction.²⁷⁷ This first motive clause is followed by a second which draws an explicit inference from the foregoing arguments: the Father knows of (and hence will supply) your needs. The reference to Gentiles paired with a reference to the heavenly Father’s care bears some resemblance to the conclusion of the Love Your Enemies cluster—in 6:35 the “unjust” are mentioned in the same breath as the heavenly Father who causes his rain to fall on the just and unjust alike.²⁷⁸ Gentiles also receive mention in 6:33. The Prayer instruction (11:2-13) similarly closes by invoking the beneficent heavenly Father. We may infer from this that the Q editor liked to bring at least some instructions to a close with a direct application which invokes the heavenly Father and the elect family relationship with him which the Q community enjoys, thereby assuring the recipients in a promissory manner of the Father’s provident care.²⁷⁹ Even 12:11-12, while not specifically mentioning the “Father,” describes a situation of dire need and promises the help of the Holy Spirit. This pattern is understandably absent in speeches directed at recalcitrant outsiders.

The indicators in 12:29-30 that the instruction is ending (inclusio, admonition, invoking the Father) raise the problem of the status of the kingdom admonition and promise clause in 12:31, designated by some as secondary because of the hints of closure in 12:29-30, a shift from negative to positive admonition, and the invocation in verse 31 of an eschatological theme, supposedly standing in tension with the sapiential idiom of verses 22-30.²⁸⁰ Other scholars, however, attribute little redaction-history significance to the sudden emphasis on eschatology and argue that, in fact, verse 31 does not conflict either thematically or form-critically with the sapiential idiom characterizing the preceding ele-

²⁷⁶ As Hoffmann, “Verbot des Sorgens,” 118, and Catchpole, “Ravens, lilies,” 81, take it.

²⁷⁷ Mack, *Rhetoric*, 51, see also Dillon, “Ravens, lilies,” 615.

²⁷⁸ Noted by Douglas, “Family, Power, Religion,” 182.

²⁷⁹ See Piper, *Wisdom*, 28, Catchpole, “Ravens, Lilies,” 81, and Hoffmann, “Verbot des Sorgens,” 117.

²⁸⁰ Zeller, “Redactional Processes,” 121; idem, *Mahnsprüche*, 87; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 213.

ments of the cluster. Kloppenborg suggests that the "Kingdom," signifying as it does God's rule, is homologous to Ma'at and Wisdom, seen in sapiential circles as guarantors and sustainers of the cosmic order.²⁸¹ He notes further that "seeking" is "frequently associated with the pursuit of Sophia," and that in the case of Q, the Kingdom of God is seen to fill that role.²⁸² Zeller notes that for the rabbis a similarly equivalent entity was the Torah.²⁸³ Von Lips draws a parallel with the "fear of God," which is sometimes presented as an alternative to anxiety in sapiential literature (citing *Tobit* 4:21; see also *Syr. Men.* 394-395).²⁸⁴ As regards form-critical factors, Betz designates verse 31 the "culmination of the argument."²⁸⁵ It conforms to what Thomas calls the "Überhöhende Mahnung" in *Pseud.-Phoc.*²⁸⁶ Concluding promise clauses are a highly recurrent feature of instructional speeches; Zeller and Kloppenborg note that frequently such clauses promise provision and even wealth in a manner similar to 12:31.²⁸⁷ *Amenemope* 16 is characterized by prohibitions against expropriating someone else's farmland for the sake of aggrandizing one's own crop production. At the end, however, it suddenly shifts to positive alternatives and the promise of God's provision: "Plough the fields [that is, your own], and you will find whatever you need.... Better the bushel which God gives you, than five thousand deceitfully gotten." *Ptahotep* 6:7-10 develops the prohibition not to gain wealth and food by terrorizing other people, but concludes with a positive admonition and promise clause: "Plan to live in peace, and what men give will come of its own accord." Prov 10:1-5 treats the theme of acquisition of wealth and food, placing the promise of divine provision in the center: "The Lord does not

²⁸¹ Kloppenborg, "Antique Instructional Genres," 140-41; see also Mack, *Rhetoric*, 51, Piper, *Wisdom*, 33, Odar Wischmeyer, "Matthäus 6:25-24 par - Die Spruchreihe vom Sorgen," *ZNW* 85 (1994) 1-22, esp. 7, 10, 12, and Grundmann, "Weisheit im Horizont," 195-96.

²⁸² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 219.

²⁸³ Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 93; idem, "Weisheitliche Überlieferung," 108; similarly, Dillon, "Ravens, Lilies," 623.

²⁸⁴ von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 219-20.

²⁸⁵ Betz, *Commentary*, 481.

²⁸⁶ Thomas, *Phokylides*, 123, note 37, 129-30.

²⁸⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 219-20, and Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 86-87, 184, citing 1 Kings 3:5-15; Ps 37:5; 55:23; Prov 3:9-10; 16:3; *Wis* 7:7-14; *Sir* 4:15, 20-28; 6:27-28; 51:28, as well as rabbinic parallels.

let the righteous go hungry, but he thwarts the craving of the wicked." *Syr. Men.* 385-396 opens with the prohibition, "Let anxieties never dominate your heart." After a series of short arguments supporting this negative command it ends with the positive command to fear God instead of being anxious (a clever inversion) along with the promises: "The main source of all good things is the fear of God, it delivers (one) from all evil things; a treasure it is." Clearly Q 12:22-31 performs a wisdom topos on right acquisition of provisions. Like other performances of the topos, the Q composition concludes by offering a positive alternative to wrongful acquisition and promises God's provision to those who act rightly in this regard.²⁸⁸ However, the wisdom it propagates is unconventional, urging that one not strive to obtain life's necessities, because God will supply, whereas traditional wisdom urges hard work to gain adequate provision.

Finally, verse 31 clarifies the enigmatic "more" of the programmatic rationale (12:23). The opening admonition (12:22) exhorted against worrying about subsistence necessities, and the main course of argumentation in 12:24-30 explained why it is reasonable to obey this injunction: God will supply food, drink, and covering (12:29-30). The rationale for its part asked, "Is not life more than food...the body more than clothing?" The final admonition, in a specific call to concrete action, describes unambiguously the life which is "more" than one consumed by concern for food and clothing: a life devoted to pursuit of the Kingdom of God.²⁸⁹ Thus the two programmatic statements in 12:22, 23 and the two final admonitions in 12:29-31 constitute a framework, between them enclosing an elaborative main body com-

²⁸⁸ See Hoffmann, *Studien*, 327, who argues that the instruction naturally requires an alternative to the futile "seeking" (ἐπιζητοῦσιν) which characterizes those outside the sect, the Gentiles. The group is called to seek (ζητεῖτε) the Kingdom of God. See also Piper, *Wisdom*, 27-28, Zeller, "Weisheitliche Überlieferung," 99, 108, idem, *Mahnsprüche*, 83, 183, Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 65, and Luise Schottroff, "Wanderprophetinnen: Eine feministische Analyse der Logienquelle," *EvT* 51 (1991) 332-44, esp. 337.

²⁸⁹ Piper, *Wisdom*, 29. Mack, *Rhetoric*, 51, suggests that "Are you not of more value than the birds?" in 12:24b picks up the "more" of 12:23. However, the "more value than the birds" of 12:24b belongs in the context of the *a minore ad maius* argument demonstrating that God will all the more supply for his children if he feeds the birds. It does not address the mystery of the qualitative "more" of human life posed by 12:23.

posed of two matched nature analogies and central gnome.²⁹⁰

Appended to the Do Not Be Anxious cluster is a short, self-contained instruction on laying up treasures (12:33-34). Schulz gives a succinct description of the form of the unit: "Auf die negative bzw. positive Mahnung (Vv 19a.20a) folgt beide Male die Rückbezug auf das Aussagewort als allgemeinen Erfahrungssatz (V 19b.c; 20b.c [Q 12:33]) abgeschlossen durch eine Gnome [Q 12:34] nach dem Schema ὅπου-ἐκεῖ."²⁹¹ Treasures in Heaven does not read well as a continuation of or even direct commentary on the preceding instruction.²⁹² Rather, it is set off from the foregoing by an apparent swing in addressee. The Do Not Be Anxious instruction has in view the hopelessly poor whose best hope and greatest need is acquisition of subsistence levels of bread and covering; 12:33 is directed at those for whom accumulating surplus wealth is at least a theoretical possibility.²⁹³ Verses 33-34 deliver a warning instruction to the well-off, those in a position to lay up accumulated goods, just as the preceding instruction (12:22-31) offers a consoling instruction to the economically and socially marginalized. Strikingly, God's fatherhood is assured only to the poor, while the rich are threatened with loss of their wealth. However, the Treasures in Heaven instruction holds out to the rich the prospect of a better life in contrast to their self-indulgent earthly life.

Be Watchful and Ready (12:35-46)

The IQP's decision to exclude 12:35-38 (unattested in Matthew) from Q is based upon the consideration that standard arguments advanced for its inclusion, while not without weight, are insufficient to warrant a far-reaching text-critical decision. These are "verbal similarities between Luke 12:35-38 and Matthew's parable of the ten virgins...it meets some of Vassiliadis' criteria for assign-

²⁹⁰ This is similar to the structure which van Leeuwen, *Context and Meaning*, 73-84, proposes for Prov 25:2-25: double-unit framework materials reflecting each other in an ABA'B' (25:2-3, 4-5, 15ab) pattern enclose a main body arranged on an ABB'A' compositional pattern (25:6-14).

²⁹¹ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 143.

²⁹² See Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 193.

²⁹³ See Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 243. In Mark 10:17-22 "you will have treasure in heaven" is directed at a rich man.

ing Sondergut to Q, and the GTh parallels to Q 12:39-40 also include the exhortation to be girded."²⁹⁴ We will adduce compositional and genre-critical considerations which support inclusion of 12:35-38 in Q and, moreover, suggest that it is an integral part of an instructional speech, with strong resemblance to the other Q instructions, extending from 12:35-46.

Both Jacobson and Claus-Peter März accept 12:35-38 into Q, but because of an alleged shift from "near-expectation" in 12:35-38 to "delay of Parousia" in 12:42-46 posit an early cluster consisting of 12:35-38, 39-40, later supplemented by 12:42-46.²⁹⁵ Crossan postulates an instructional speech pattern quite close to that which has emerged in this chapter: two parables (12:36-38; 42-46) flank a central aphoristic unit (12:39-40).²⁹⁶ Virtually all that is lacking in his reconstruction is the opening programmatic maxim or admonition. If 12:35 is taken as that admonition, then the cluster displays the following familiar form:

Programmatic Admonition (35): [Let your belts be fastened and your lamps burning,

Double Parables (36-39): and be like people who are expecting their master to come home from the marriage feast, so that when he comes and knocks they may open the door immediately to him. Blessed are those servants whom the master finds awake when he comes. Truly, I tell you, he will put on an apron and have them recline, and he will come and serve them. Even if he comes in the second watch, or in the third, and finds them so, blessed are those servants!] But know this, that if the houseowner had known in which watch the thief was coming, he would not have let his house be dug into.

²⁹⁴ Stanley D. Anderson, "Database and Evaluation of Luke 12:35-38," *Documenta Q*, 1-12, esp. 10, cited in typescript. The value of Anderson's IQP database and evaluation is impaired by the fact that they do not cite the important studies of März, Kollmann, and Jacobson (see below), which likely appeared too late for consideration; at any rate, the IQP's discussion is out of date.

²⁹⁵ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 197-98; Claus-Peter März, "...läßt eure Lampen brennen!" *Studien zur Q-Vorlage von Lk 12,35-14,24*, Erfurter Theologische Schriften 20 (Leipzig: St. Benno, 1991), 66-68.

²⁹⁶ Crossan, *In Fragments*, 58.

Central Admonition (40): You also must be ready; for the Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect.

Double Parables (42-46): Who then is the faithful and wise servant whom the lord put over his household to give them food on time? Blessed is that servant whose lord, when he comes, will find so doing. Truly, I tell you that he will appoint him over all his possessions. But if that servant says in his heart, My lord is delayed, and begins to beat the servants and to eat and drink and get drunk, the lord of that servant will come on a day he does not expect and at an hour that he does not know, and will cut him to pieces and put his lot with the faithless.

März characterizes the opening (verse 35) as "ein feierliches, von alttestamentlicher Metaphorik geprägtes Mahnwort" which introduces the following instruction to watchfulness and readiness. The body of the instruction, unified by considerations of eschatological reward and punishment, specifies and interprets this general, highly figurative, and enigmatic admonition in the direction of watchfulness and correct behavior in the time of the master's absence. Thus it constitutes paraenesis for the Q community.²⁹⁷ März notes that the double admonition's imagery of self-girding and burning lamps is drawn from Exod 12:11 and Prov 31:17-

²⁹⁷ Claus-Peter März, "Zur Q-Rezeption in Lk 12,35-13,35 (14,1-24)," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, 177-208, esp. 194; more briefly Polag, *Christologie*, 100. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 149-51; idem, "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q," in *Gospel Behind the Gospels*, 275-319, esp. 294-95 (see also Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 197), prefers to take it as a warning to outsiders because its uncompromising tone of judgment aligns 12:39-46 with other Q threats of judgment directed at outsiders. However, the servants of 12:42-46 are in a subordinate relationship to the "master," clearly a metaphorical description of the Son of Man. This is a characterization more apposite to members of the group; moreover, why would outsiders be admonished to be "faithful and wise servants"? The harshness of punishment threatened to insiders is not a great deal different from the threat of 12:4-7, 8-9; within a sociology of sectarianism the group would be described as having a rigorist position with respect to apostasy. "Will give him an inheritance with the faithless" is a threat of status-reversal from "in" to "out".

18 respectively. The first depicts an attitude of readiness in view of imminent judgment, a leading motif of the last section of Q. The second “hat eher den tätigen Einsatz und stetige Dienstbereitschaft als angemessene eschatologische Haltung vor Augen.”²⁹⁸ This being the case, the first parabolic unit (12:36-38) incorporates the readiness, watchfulness, dining, and night imagery derived from the archetypal Passover story, while the second parabolic unit (12:42-46) exploits the imagery of faithful and wise household management which is the governing motif of the poem of the excellent wife in Prov 31.²⁹⁹ Thus the opening admonition maps out the instruction in a precise manner: the Passover imagery of the first half of the maxim is developed in the first parable, the household administration implicit in the second half of the maxim in the second parable. This sequential unfolding of a bipartite programmatic opening admonition with illustrative units replicates the compositional pattern followed in Q 12:22-31, and as noted there, the homily format outlined by Borgen and Stegner.

Comparison with the parallel tradition in Mark 13:34-36 shows that just those components of the Q version which can be put down to the formation of an instruction, namely, the appending of a programmatic admonition and the concomitant infusion of the primitive parabolic tradition with the dining imagery of the Passover, are precisely the additive elements.³⁰⁰ Bernd Kollmann points this out and notes that *Did* 16:1, “Watch (γρηγορεῖτε) over your life: let your lamps be not quenched and your loins be not ungirded, but be ready, for ye know not the hour in which our Lord cometh,” reproduces, albeit with slightly different wording, elements of 12:35, 37 (γρηγοροῦντας), 40. He argues that since *Did* 16:1 was likely not influenced by Luke—the wording is different from Luke’s version and *Didache* elsewhere shows no evidence of knowing Luke—“beruht die Parallelität von Lk 12,35 und *Did* 16,1b folglich aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach nicht auf

²⁹⁸ März, *Studien*, 61-63.

²⁹⁹ März notes the following intertextual connections: “Who is the faithful and wise steward?” is reminiscent of Prov 31:10; supplying of food to the household recalls Prov 31:14-15; the promised reward of 12:44 is reminiscent of Prov 31:31 (*Studien*, 61-63).

³⁰⁰ We proposed a similar scenario for the composition of the Q Beelzebul speech.

literarischer Abhängigkeit, sondern auf unabhängig voneinander erfolgter Rezeption ähnlicher Tradition."³⁰¹ Kollmann is inclined to make this tradition pre-Q, but if *Did* 16:1 reflects in a fractured manner the combination of programmatic maxim with parabolic illustrative material characteristic of Q composition, then Q itself may be the source of that tradition, though transmission to the *Didache* may have been through oral channels. *Did* 16:1 aside, the fact that "banqueting" is a recurrent, cohesion-creating motif in the final section of Q increases the likelihood that the Amen-saying in 12:37b is part of the same redactional initiative which appropriated the watchfulness parable from the pre-Markan tradition, supplied it with a programmatic maxim, and expanded it with a reference to a banquet with the Son of Man upon his return.

With the first parable (12:36-38) commences the familiar instructional process (explored by Piper) of specifying and applying the highly figurative and thus opaque opening admonition to a specific community situation. Its opening imperative, "Be like people who are expecting their master...", indicates that the situation is one of separation and absence of the Lord.³⁰² The girt loins and the burning lamps of the opening admonition are now understood to depict metaphorically an attitude of expectant readiness which is to characterize the life of the group in the absence of its master. Supplementation of the basic parable with a macarism and an Amen saying depicting a banquet at which the community participates reinforces the motivating power of the basic parable taken from the tradition.³⁰³ The reciprocal service the "master" supplies to his servants as a reward for their readiness is reminiscent of the advocacy service the Son of Man renders to those who courageously confess him before men in Q 12:8-9.³⁰⁴

Verse 39 alters the imagery of verses 36-38: instead of expectant servants we have a houseowner; instead of a returning mas-

³⁰¹ Bernd Kollmann, "Lk 12,35-38—ein Gleichnis der Logienquelle," *ZNW* 81 (1990) 254-62, esp. 258-59.

³⁰² Polag, *Christologie*, 100, who notes the similar situation which obtains in the second parabolic unit.

³⁰³ März, *Studien*, 62. As Sato, *Prophetie*, 263, notes, the result is a heterogeneous product; similarly Crossan, *In Fragments*, 58-59.

³⁰⁴ März, *Studien*, 62, points out that in verse 35 the servants are περιζωσμένοι, whereas in verse 37b the master περιζώσεται.

ter a burglar; and instead of a welcoming opening of the door a forced entry. Such a precise reversal of images and mood (from pleasant images of wedding and banquet to fearsome images of thief and violent break-in) must be calculated rather than adventitious. It thus witnesses to a deliberate—albeit antithetical—connection to the foregoing parable in Q, and suggests that the editor wished to supplement a positive with a negative motivation.³⁰⁵ The same compositional technique is evident in Q 12:4-7, except there the threatening motivation comes first.³⁰⁶ Though Matthew's appropriation of Q begins with this unit, thus creating the impression that verse 39 goes with the Son of Man saying in verse 40, this and other considerations suggest that as regards Q composition verse 39 is the final unit in the catena of parabolic material which begins with verse 36. First, 12:39 like the foregoing is parabolic and illustrative. Second, though the mood and images shift from pleasant to fearsome, the semantic structure of verse 39 is the same as verses 36-38: at issue is a house, entrances, an unexpected arrival, and personae waiting. Third (as noted above), the redactional pairing of positive with negative motivation within one unit is attested in Q 12:4-7. Fourth, the parabolic counterpart in 12:42-46 likewise connects pleasant and fearsome scenes into one illustrative unit, and in both 12:36-39 and 12:42-46 the threat-parable follows an Amen-saying.³⁰⁷ Clearly the editor who has linked 12:39 to 12:36-38 and 12:45-46 with 12:42-43 wishes to communicate that the coming of the Son of Man announced in the center (12:40) can have two possible outcomes, depending on faithfulness, even for members of the household.

Verse 40, the Son of Man saying, thus forms the aphoristic heart of the composition, though the appending of the imperative, "You also must be ready," gives it admonitory force.³⁰⁸ This

³⁰⁵ März, *Studien*, 62-63. März also suggests that the τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε of 12:39 makes a secure backwards connection (59).

³⁰⁶ It is surely no accident that both 12:2-12 and 12:35-46 are, in effect, warnings against apostasy.

³⁰⁷ On the editorial activity evident in these precise correspondences see März, "Q Rezeption," 193-94. The notion that Luke created these connections is unlikely in view of manifest similarities with Q composition elsewhere. The fact that *Luke 12:41, 42a and 47-48 disturb if not efface the parallelism with 12:35-39* does not speak for Lukan authorship of the latter.

³⁰⁸ Crossan, *In Fragments*, 59, calls it an aphorism, von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 214, a *Mahnung*.

is a discrete, self-contained pronouncement with an autonomous function. It makes a specific application of the opening maxim and intervening illustrative material and by so doing unambiguously articulates the deliberative issue at stake in the entire composition. It explicitly identifies the personae represented metaphorically in the preceding parabolic material: the Son of Man is *both* the master returning from the wedding feast who will fête his faithful servants *and* the threatening figure of the thief who breaks into the house violently and unexpectedly. The faithful servants in the first parable and the watchful houseowner of the second are exemplary paradigms for the addressees, the "you," the members of the Q group, who are exhorted by this instruction to emulate such watchfulness.³⁰⁹ Verse 40 thus functions as the specific, monitory application of 12:35-39 as well as an explanation of what was meant by the enigmatic opening admonition, "Let your belts be fastened and your lamps burning."³¹⁰ As a coordinating saying 12:40 also anticipates the parabolic materials in 12:42-46, supplying the interpretive key by which to unlock the specific referents and applications veiled by the metaphors of household, steward, servants, and master.³¹¹ Finally, 12:40 expresses an oblique christological self-reference, and thus resembles the central sayings 6:40; 11:20; and 11:33 (see also 12:8-9).

For their part verses 42-46 further unfold the meaning of the figurative opening admonition and the explicit admonition to

³⁰⁹ To be sure, there is a slight clash of logic between the parable of 12:39 and the Son of Man admonitory saying. Kloppenborg notes that 12:39 "has to do with the prevention of theft through foresight and watchfulness, but 12:40 implies that the coming of the Son of Man cannot be foreseen nor its catastrophic results prevented" (*Formation*, 149; see also Schenk, *Synopse*, 94). However, the phrase, "the Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not expect," specifically takes account of the image of 12:40 and turns it into a kind of *a minore ad maius* argument for increased watchfulness, namely, "If you knew when the thief was planning to show up, you would be very watchful. How much more watchful you ought to be if you know the Son of Man is coming, but without any idea when!"

³¹⁰ See März, *Studien*, 63.

³¹¹ Kloppenborg, "Parables of Jesus," 293; idem, *Formation*, 153. When combined with Schürmann's observation ("Son of Man Title," 87) that 12:40 functions as the redactional conclusion to 12:35-39, the programmatic coordinating function of 12:40 emerges clearly. Because März, *Studien*, 62, takes 12:40 as the conclusion of 12:35-38, he is forced to view 12:42-46 as an "interpretierender Anhang."

readiness delivered by the central aphorism, using the concretizing analogy of responsible stewardship conducted in the absence of the master. If the first parabolic units were outward-directed, focused on anticipation of the master's return, these units are inward-directed, focused upon the faithful discharge of duties within the community in the interim.³¹²

The illustrative unit in verses 42-46 is closely modeled upon the structure of its counterpart, verses 36-39; likely, the same hand configured both. As noted, both units divide into a positive and negative parable.³¹³ In both the second parable reverses the motifs of the first.³¹⁴ Macarisms which refer to the coming of the master pronounce blessing upon the persons whose behavior conforms to the good example. Both units insert an Amen-saying after the respective macarisms spelling out the reward the returned master will give to his faithful servants.³¹⁵ Hence both units are self-contained wisdom *Lehrreden* or *Mahnreden* using exemplary paradigms and a motivational apparatus which alternates promises of blessing with threats of divine sanction.³¹⁶ Verses 42-46 strike a conventional wisdom theme by asking about a "faithful and wise" servant, define him or her in a beatitude as one who is constantly prepared, promise a future reward, and then conclude with a description of the antitype and the corresponding sanction. Thus despite the diversity of forms, 12:35-39 and 12:42-46 form parallel and unified instructional compositions whose symmetry has been disturbed by Lukan additions (12:41, 47-48).³¹⁷

This instruction lacks a concluding admonition or closing maxim, likely because the strongly hortative and explicit central saying adequately fulfills the admonitory function of the instruction in

³¹² März, "Q-Rezeption," 194, referring to Alfons Weiser, *Die Knechtgleichnisse der synoptischen Evangelien* (Münich: Kosel, 1971), 179. See also März, *Studien*, 63, 68, and Sato, *Prophetie*, 262.

³¹³ Noted by März, *Studien*, 62; idem, "Q-Rezeption," 189, 194. Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 70, notes that 12:42-46 is structured "nach dem Schema von Segen und Fluch...."

³¹⁴ See Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 396-97.

³¹⁵ Crossan, *In Fragments*, 58-60, who notes in addition that the insertion of a macarism in the middle of a parabolic unit is unusual. See also Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 197.

³¹⁶ Schenk, *Synopse*, 96, on 12:42-46, Sato, *Prophetie*, 262, and Edwards, *Theology*, 66.

³¹⁷ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 274.

tandem with the opening admonition. Both illustrative units are themselves strongly admonitory.

Discerning the Times (12:49, 51, 53-59)

Though the IQP takes a commendably cautious position with regard to the Q status of 12:49, flagging it with a question-mark, there are good if short of decisive grounds for its inclusion in Q.³¹⁸ Our purpose here is to show that compositional considerations support the inclusion of 12:49 in Q.

At first glance the three aphoristic units which make up this cluster (12:49, 51, 53; 54-56; 57-59) do not show obvious signs of meaningful interconnections. Kloppenborg suggests that the three units cohere by virtue of their common adducing of apocalyptic warnings to comment upon the preceding parables' introduction of the judgment motif (see 12:45-46) and to heighten awareness of the crisis of the present times.³¹⁹ März has proposed a compositional arrangement which coheres in important respects with several other Q instructions analyzed thus far. He suggests that 12:49 is the programmatic aphorism ("zusammen-

³¹⁸ See Albrecht Garsky and Christoph Heil, "Database and Evaluation Luke 12:49," in *Documenta Q*, 1-15, cited in typescript. Garsky and Heil recommend against inclusion. I can follow them with regard to 12:49b, but do not consider their reasons for assigning 12:49a to Luke sufficient to sustain a decision to exclude it from Q. (1) The fact that 12:50 replicates the Lukan practice of toning down expressions of enthusiastic near-expectation does not serve as an argument for attributing 12:49 to Luke. (2) Garsky and Heil point out that in Luke, "fire" tends to refer to the outpouring of the Spirit. However, the fact that, in the context of Luke-Acts, 12:49 can be understood in this manner does not say anything about its significance in Q, where, in fact, "fire" appears quite unequivocally to refer to judgment (3:9, 17; see also 17:28). At this point, however, I can agree that 12:49b may represent a Lukan redactional comment on 12:49a, by which Jesus longingly looks forward to the Pentecostal fire. (3) LXX parallels to the structure and vocabulary of 11:49 do not speak against Q origins for the saying, since the LXX was also known to Q. Most arguments for Lukan composition apply only to 12:49b. (4) The convention of linking "fire" with "sword" in apocalyptic judgment contexts lead Garsky and Heil to acknowledge, "...kann nicht ausgeschlossen werden, daß 12:49a in Q mit 12,51 verbunden gewesen ist." Their reasons—because 12:49b may well be Lukan, and because "in Q vier ἡλθον-Worte aufeinandergefolgt wären"—are not sufficient to support their conclusion "daß auch 12,49a aus der Hand des Lk stammt." In fact, serialization of ἡλθον sayings could be equally taken as evidence that 12:49a belongs with Q 12:51, 53.

³¹⁹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 152-53.

fassende Eingangsthese") for the entire instruction.³²⁰ By adducing the word "fire" and thus establishing a connection generally to the motif-history of the metaphor and specifically to the judgment by fire prophesied by John in Q 3:16, the opening aphorism strikes the theme for the following instruction: an announcement of imminent judgment, proclaimed and (soon) to be carried out by Jesus.³²¹ Despite intratextual connections to Q 3:9, 16-17, the aphorism is metaphorical and thus well-suited for an elaboration which will draw out its significance for this deliberative setting.

The crisis setting of impending judgment inaugurated by the appearance of Jesus is specified by 12:51, 53 as the time of final tribulation manifesting itself in the sign of family division as prophesied in Micah 7:6.³²² Kloppenborg states, "Both the motif of war [the "sword"] and that of division of families are traditional apocalyptic *topoi* used to signify the utter chaos and social disorder which will portend the eschatological intervention of God."³²³ This "sign" may reflect the actual experience of the Q group and the effect of its message upon surrounding society. Verses 51, 53 have a monitory undertone, the effect of which is to give a hortatory application to the opening aphorism (12:49a). The critical nature of the times translates easily to a demand that people take a stand for or against Jesus, a decision which cannot take normative social considerations such as the solidarity of the family into account. As a sign of the end, family divisions simultaneously attest to and are demanded by the situation of impending judgment. That family division is actually a sign of the end allows 12:51, 53 to function as a motivation: because impending judgment is looming over society, people should reconcile themselves to the disturbing family divisions which adher-

³²⁰ März, *Studien*, 21.

³²¹ März, *Studien*, 10-11, 19, 25; idem "Q Rezeption," 195; see also Sato, *Prophetie*, 293-94, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 151, and Polag, *Christologie*, 165. Horsley, "Logoi Propheton," 197, because he overlooks the programmatic function of 12:49, under-appraises the sense of imminency which charges the entire cluster.

³²² März, *Studien*, 51-52; idem, "Q Rezeption," 194-95.

³²³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 151-52 (citing Isa 34:5; 66:16; *1 Enoch* 63:22; 91:12; 100:1-2; *2 Apoc. Bar.* 70:6, and for family division *1 Enoch* 99:5; 100:1-2; *Jub* 23:16, 19; *2 Apoc. Bar.* 70:6; Mark 13:12). See also Schenk, *Synopse*, 97, Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 260, and Sato, *Prophetie*, 295-96.

ence to the elect community entails.³²⁴ The announcement of judgment which propels the instruction does not break this monitory framework, for it establishes the deliberative context.

März takes 12:51, 53 as directed at community members to strengthen them in their resolve to continue to pay the price of family division. Taken alone, it is certainly possible to understand these verses in that way; however, the juxtaposed units, 12:54-56, 57-59, tend rather to assume an audience of outsiders—those blind and destined for judgment. Since these help shape the context for 12:51, 53, it is best to take the latter as likewise directed protreptically toward outsiders: given the present crisis—nothing less than the time of the end anticipated by the prophets—family division is the price of entrance into the elect community.

Verses 54-56, assuming that they can be ascribed to Q³²⁵ in both Matthew and Luke consist of an admonition framed as a rhetorical question appended to a bipartite weather proverb.³²⁶ Despite wide variation in Matthew's and Luke's renderings of the unit, both make essentially the same point: the common ability to read the weather is contrasted with the auditors' inability to apprehend clear evidence of the epochal significance of the times.³²⁷ The accusation of failure to perceive the obvious replicates the rhetorical environment of Q 11:29-35, similarly addressed to outsiders. The "need to understand what is appropriate or timely, *καίρως*, and act accordingly" is a topos of ancient wisdom literature.³²⁸ By adducing this topos in the middle of this particular instruction, Q makes it speak to its own concern: having the sagacity to discern the crisis of impending judgment and act accordingly.³²⁹ The fact that 12:54-56 is flanked by materials

³²⁴ März, *Studien*, 51-52.

³²⁵ Here I follow the IQP's cautious inclusion and reconstruction of 12:54-56.

³²⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 152; März, *Studien*, 38.

³²⁷ Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 252; März, *Studien*, 38-39.

³²⁸ Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 65, citing Sir 4:20; 11:25-28; 20:1; 22:6; 24:7; *Ps.-Phoc.* 82, 121; *Sentences of Sextus* 160, 163; similarly Zeller, "Weisheitliche Überlieferung," 107. See also Hesiod, *Works and Days*, which repeatedly emphasizes the need to correctly evaluate the times and to order one's life accordingly.

³²⁹ Zeller, "Weisheitliche Überlieferung," 107; see also März, *Studien*, 38-39, Polag, *Christologie*, 88, and Bultmann, *History*, 116.

making explicit reference to approaching judgment and the signs of the times (12:49, 51, 53; 57-59) indicates that this proverb + scolding admonition constitutes the gnomic center of this instruction.³³⁰ Comparison with 11:33, another central gnomic saying which likewise adduces the obvious manifestation of a sign in a context of dull incomprehension, corroborates this proposal. Kloppenborg states that the unit 12:54-56 "implies that the signs of the end are apparent to all, and that only blindness stands in the way of an appropriate response to the impending catastrophe."³³¹ The flanking units recommend specific actions to be taken in light of the crisis of the times expressed in the center unit. To be sure, 12:51, 53 and 12:58-59 are gnomic as well, or at any rate aphoristic, but as März notes, they appeal for specific action while the middle unit expresses the core sapiential value of correctly discerning the times, a discernment that forms the basis for those requisite moral commitments.³³² In a similar manner the preceding, community-oriented instruction, 12:35-46, makes paraenetic recommendations in the parabolic units which flank the central aphorism, an aphorism which urges readiness in light of the unexpected coming of the Son of Man. Verses 54-56 also comment in a linear manner upon verses 51, 53: the first unit by its allusion to Micah 7:6 and other apocalyptic topoi hints that the manifestations attending the proclamation of Jesus are signs of the end; verses 54-56 make this explicit, emphasizing in addition the need to correctly discern these signs.³³³

Form-critically the last unit, 12:58-59, consists of two sayings: first, a common-sense rule on the wisdom of settling with an opponent before one gets to court lest a catastrophe occur there; second, a threat of judgment. The first unit is an admonition to which is attached a negative motive clause spelling out the likelihood of condemnation and imprisonment should one fail to reconcile with the opponent before reaching the place of judgment. The second saying repeats and intensifies the threat of judgment and depicts the long duration of this fate. By itself this double

³³⁰ See März, *Studien*, 48.

³³¹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 152.

³³² März, *Studien*, 48.

³³³ März, *Studien*, 34.

unit is metaphorical and this-worldly, but in the context of the preceding sayings and in the light of the programmatic aphorism it defines the present as being a crisis time of impending judgment in which only brief opportunity remains for repentance before catastrophe.³³⁴ The parable's description of the situation as being "on the way" to the judge takes up the motif of imminency and urgency first sounded by the opening aphorism: only a short time remains before the place of judgment is reached.³³⁵ The combination of these two concluding units along with the crisis context established by the aphorisms which precede it enable 12:58-59 to function as a conditional announcement of judgment.³³⁶ In fact the whole unit beginning from 12:49a announces impending judgment but in the form of a deliberative speech calling for decisive commitment, centered around the wisdom topos of discerning the times.

The fact that the instruction is brought to closure by a specific admonition to reconcile brings it into conformity with other Q instructions studied thus far. März states, "12,58 bildete dann den Zielpunkt dieser Spruchkette, indem aus solcher Erkenntnis der Zeit zur Umkehr in letzter Stunde aufgerufen wird."³³⁷ Because this concluding admonition with its motive clauses specifies the present crisis as being a crisis of impending judgment, it makes explicit the opening announcement of the casting of fire upon the earth (12:49a).³³⁸

Schematizing the compositional arrangement of this unit may seem somewhat arbitrary given the close connection of the programmatic aphorism (12:49a) with the sword saying (12:51), so close, in fact, that one might be tempted to treat the "fire" aphorism and the "sword" aphorism as a paired set of programmatic aphorisms, and the "divisions in families" aphorism as a first descriptive unit. However, the "sword" and "division in families"

³³⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 152-53; März, *Studien*, 35, 55; Schenk, *Synopse*, 98; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 65-67; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 423; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 213; Edwards, *Theology*, 129; Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, 30. Kloppenborg notes that Sir 18:20 had already transposed the wisdom idea of timely reconciliation into a setting of divine judgment.

³³⁵ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 154; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 41.

³³⁶ Sato, *Prophetie*, 221.

³³⁷ März, *Studien*, 34; see also Kloppenborg, "Social History," 93, and Manson, *Sayings of Jesus*, 30.

³³⁸ März, *Studien*, 34-35, 48-50.

sayings have a close thematic affinity as well as a γάρ link which suggests that 12:51 initiates the cluster's elaboration after the opening aphorism. Though all three major units (12:51, 53; 12:54-56; 12:58-59) explicitly or implicitly call to some kind of action in view of the present crisis, and though 12:54-56 and 12:58-59 both invoke wisdom topoi to draw out specific applications, the fact remains that the middle unit seems to encapsulate the central concern of the speech—discerning the present time. In light of the crisis of the times, both 12:51, 53 and 12:58-59 call to specific commitment and action, the former implicitly, the latter explicitly. This produces a composition with important points of resemblance with 12:35-46 (Be Watchful and Ready). Both feature a central admonition to alertness in light of an impending crisis that will spell disaster for the unwary. In both the central unit is flanked by two units which spell out appropriate consequences and actions given this state of affairs. Both are prefaced by a highly symbolic opening aphorism. Both conclude with a threat of judgment in case of failure to follow the recommended course of action. The difference is that 12:35-46 is directed paraenetically toward insiders, 12:49-59 protreptically toward outsiders.

Programmatic Aphorism (49a): I have come to bring fire (πῦρ) upon the earth.

Concretization (51, 53):

Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. For I have come to separate son from father, and daughter from her mother, and daughter-in-law from her mother-in-law.

Central Sayings (54-56):

When it is evening you say, Good weather, for the sky is red (πυρρόζει), and in the morning, Today will be stormy, for the sky is loweringly red (πυρρόζει). You know how to judge the appearance of the sky, but you cannot judge the times?

Closing Admonition and Threat of Judgment (57-58): Come to terms quickly with a plaintiff against you while you are going with him on the way, lest the plaintiff hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the guard, and you be thrown

into prison. Amen, I tell you, you will not leave there till you have paid the last penny.

Enter Through the Narrow Door (13:24-30; 14:11, 16-24, 26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35)

This instruction consists of quite heterogeneous materials in turn strewn across a longer section of Luke's travel narrative, rendering it an uninviting place for scholars to try their hand at composition analyses. Bultmann not only thought that the unit ended with 13:30, but also suggested that it was Luke who assembled it "from all sorts of pieces."³³⁹ Among contemporary scholars Hoffmann holds this view as well.³⁴⁰ However, a common order in Luke 13:24-29 and Matthew 7:13-14, 22-23; 8:11-12 suggests a Q sequencing of these units, in turn raising the possibility of an extended Q composition.

Kloppenborg argues for the presence of a Q instruction consisting of all the Q material between the narrow door admonition in 13:24 and the salt saying in 14:34-35 (minus 14:11). He proposes a two-stage redaction history for its formation. The first stage brought together a group of community-directed sayings on discipleship: 13:24, 14:26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35, sayings which emphasize the difficult nature of following Jesus. The second redaction expanded this sapiential instruction by inserting prophetic announcements of judgment directed at outsiders who had rejected the community's proclamation: 13:25-27, 28-30; 13:34-35; 14:16-24. Corresponding to the announcement of judgment upon Israel, these inserted units show openness towards the incorporation of Gentiles.³⁴¹

The following analysis will confirm Kloppenborg's proposal that these units, separated and spread out in Luke, formed in Q a contiguous instruction. Differences emerge with regard to the Q location of 13:34-35, which in Matthew follows upon Q 11:49-51. Kloppenborg accepts its Lukan location, which places it in the center of this instruction. His main reason for doing so is

³³⁹ Bultmann, *History*, 130.

³⁴⁰ Paul Hoffmann, "Πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας. Redaktion und Tradition in Lc 13, 22-30," *ZNW* 58 (1967) 188-214.

³⁴¹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 223-37; see especially 237.

based on the principle *complexio difficilior potior est*—the less organized location is the better: “In this case, Matthew’s is the more deliberate, and organized, Luke’s is less so.”³⁴² Kloppenborg invokes this principle to escape from indecisive, *ad hoc* redaction-critical arguments which campaign pro and con for either the Matthean or Lukan location. This stalemate demonstrates, however, that both the Lukan and Matthean locations for 13:34-35 can be construed as making good compositional sense within their own terms of reference, thus raising questions about the *difficilior* assessment. Advocates for the Lukan location tend to do so, at least in part, on the basis of the supposed excellence of its compositional connections there, and argue that such are superior to Matthew’s.³⁴³ Moreover, a redactionally motivated transposition or interpolation by one or the other of the evangelists, though making good compositional sense in the new text, might damage what might have been a fine Q arrangement, rendering it “less organized,” but not for that reason more primitive. For these reasons Kloppenborg’s principle, while useful, is not definitive. Heil concludes that if Q is assumed to have a “rhetorical strategy”, and accordingly a “coherent and consistent” layout, “the text-critical criterion of the *lectio difficilior* does not apply....”³⁴⁴

Analysis which invokes the linguistic principles of cohesion and communicative effect in text production can be usefully applied in this case. When the focus is narrowed to the Q instructional unit which Kloppenborg has defined, with the foregoing, intervening, and following Lukan special material subtracted out (and with supercessionist theological categories bracketed—the alleged rejection of Israel), 13:34-35 is shown to be indigestibly intrusive; that is, apart from its connection with the neighboring Lukan special material, it has no compositional, communicative valence,

³⁴² Personal communication, July 27, 1995.

³⁴³ See Steven R. Johnson, “Database and Evaluation Luke 13:34-35,” in *Documenta Q*, esp. 1-28, typescript. Like Kloppenborg, Johnson looks for some solid principle upon which to base a decision in a case in which redaction-critical arguments are strong on both sides, and finds it in the general Lukan tendency to preserve the order of Q.

³⁴⁴ Heil, “Reception of Q in Luke,” 3-4. Eliezer Segal, *Case Citation in the Babylonian Talmud. The Evidence of the Tractate Neziqin*, BJS 210 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), cites as one of his redaction-history indicators: “Aramaic explanations which digress and interfere with the architectonic symmetry of the *sugya*” (123).

even as—and this is the critical point—a putative redactional interpolation. The motifs of the maternal hen and her chicks, of murder, of loss of sight, of abandonment, and of departure and return which pervade 13:34-35 have only the most tenuous points of contact jointly or severally with elements of the Enter Through the Narrow Door instruction. The “house” of the 13:34-35 oracle is “your” house (referent probably the Temple) and abandoned to boot.³⁴⁵ By contrast, the focus of the surrounding material is securing entrance to the “house” of the Enter Through the Narrow Door instruction. This house is full, it is the venue of festive banquets, it belongs to the householder who throws the banquet, and the group given a negative profile by the instruction is variously shut out, bounced, or depicted scorning the invitation to enter. In short, the house imagery in the instruction is used in a manner opposed to its use in 13:34-35; the respective references and related constellations of motifs are unrelated; the significance of 13:34-35 in its present context arises solely from its connection with Lukan composition and *Sondergut* in 13:31-33.³⁴⁶ A certain tradition-history discrepancy among constituent units of a composition is to be expected and from time to time the deployment of anti-types for comparative purposes. However, the oracle’s failure to make a connection, indeed, its clash with the *Leitmotifs* of the Q material surrounding it fore and aft cannot be accommodated within any such redactional scenario. Such lack of any relation between conjoined traditions could be tolerated only if one assumes the *Kleinliteratur* formative model. It bears repeating that the verses in question cannot give an account of themselves even as a redactional gloss. Moreover, the formidable array of arguments in favor of the Matthean location must be taken into account.³⁴⁷

This assessment that 13:34-35 is hopelessly intrusive within the narrowly defined Q context in which it appears (in Luke) and

³⁴⁵ See Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 117.

³⁴⁶ On the connection of segments of text with other obviously secondary material as constituting an important redaction-history indicator see Segal, *Case Citation*, 152.

³⁴⁷ “Intrusiveness” is a criterion by which redaction histories are legitimately posited, but if one wants to get beyond the clotting traditions of *Kleinliteratur*, it should be possible to give at least some account of the sense of the new redaction.

thus compositionally foreign is corroborated by analysis of the instruction itself, to which we now turn.

März's programmatic statement for the formation of this cluster follows the accretion, tradition-history model: "Die thematische Abstufung läßt dabei auf ein traditionsgeschichtliches Gefälle schließen, in dem die sich konstituierende Spruchgruppe offenbar immer neu auf die sich wandelnde Verkündigungssituation hin aktualisiert würde."³⁴⁸ The cluster's supposed expansion is plotted along a social history which turns upon the pivot of Israel's alleged rejection of the message. März suggests that the final form juxtaposes three units: 13:24, 25-30; 14:16-24, in contrast to an original combination of 13:24, 25-27. März argues that as it became apparent to the tradents that Israel would reject the message, the primitive "Spruchkombination" expanded with the addition ("sich angefügt") of 13:28-30, with the Great Banquet parable in 14:16-24 attached "nachträglich" as a *Begründung*, a parable taken by März as codifying the Q group's exasperation with Israel's supposed recalcitrance. Q redaction then integrated this expanded sayings-cluster into a more encompassing Q text.³⁴⁹ Despite this multi-stage account of the growth of the cluster, März tries to make sense of it as a rhetorically integrated unit, characterizing it as an "eschatologischen Mahnrede."³⁵⁰

With the judgment oracle (13:34-35) eliminated from the cluster, and extending it forward as Kloppenborg does to 14:34-35, the Enter Through the Narrow Door instruction displays a form similar to that of other Q-instructions studied thus far:

Programmatic Admonition(13:24): Enter through the narrow door, for many will seek to enter and few will find it.

Banquet Parable (13:25-29): When the house owner has locked the door, you will begin .. to knock, .. saying, "Lord, open for us." He will answer you, "I do not know you." Then you will start saying, "We ate and drank with you, and you taught in our streets." And he will say to you, "I do not

³⁴⁸ März, *Studien*, 108; see also page 98.

³⁴⁹ März is not clear as to whether 14:16-24 was added at the same time as 13:28-30 or at the time of the Q-redaction.

³⁵⁰ März, *Studien*, 96.

know you .. Away from me, evildoers.”

Many shall come from the east and the west and recline with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God, but you will be thrown out; there people will weep and gnash their teeth.

Gnomic Sayings (13:30; 14:11): The last will be first and the first will be last.

Everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, and the one who humbles himself will be exalted.

Banquet Parable (14:16-24):

And he said to them, “The kingdom of God is like a man who made a great banquet; and he sent his servant to say to the invited, ‘Come, for it is now ready.’ They all began to make excuses. [The first said,] ‘I have bought a field, [and I must go out and inspect it; I ask you, have me excused.’ And another] said, ‘I have bought [five yoke of oxen, and I go to examine them; I ask you, have me excused.’ And another] said, ‘I have married a wife [and therefore I cannot come.]’ And upon returning the servant announced these things to his lord. Then the householder, enraged, said to his servant, ‘Go out quickly to the streets and whomever you may find, invite to the occasion.’ And after going out into the streets the servant gathered all whom he found; and the house was filled.”

Aphorisms (14:26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35): If any one does not hate his own father and mother, he cannot be my disciple; and if any one does not hate son and daughter, he cannot be my disciple. He who does not take his cross and follow me cannot be my disciple.

The one who finds his life will lose it, and the one who loses his life for my sake will find it.

Salt is good; but if salt becomes insipid,

with what will it be seasoned? It is fit
neither for the land nor for the dunghheap;
they throw it out.

Q 13:24, consisting of an admonition + motive clause based on a warning, is a conventional opening of an instructional speech. The admonition itself, depicting as it does the difficulty of achieving salvation but urging dedication to that goal, picks up a wisdom topos, though perhaps with apocalyptic flavoring.³⁵¹ Taken by itself, 13:24 is general, enigmatically metaphorical, and thus in need of elaboration to bring out its significance for a specific admonitory situation.³⁵² Corresponding to its hermeneutical openness and threshold position, 13:24 assumes a programmatic function with respect to the instruction which follows: it qualifies the following elaboration with all its heterogeneous materials as an instruction whose goal it is to motivate obedience to the opening demand to “enter the narrow door,” that is, to enter the kingdom despite the difficulties which attend the choice.³⁵³ Moreover, the admonition expresses the programmatic contrast of “entry” and “exclusion” as well as the related contrast of “inside” and “outside”, both of which are taken up and expressed by the examples, maxims, and aphorisms which make up the rest of the instruction.³⁵⁴ A third contrast established by 13:24 replicated in the following units is between “present” (“strive to enter through the narrow door”) and “future” (“for many will seek to enter and will not find it”). Finally, the motive clause contains an intimation of judgment expanded upon in the instruction.³⁵⁵

An anomaly appears at this point which requires explanation. The “few” entrants versus the “many” excluded is also expressed programmatically in 13:24. However, by the time we reach the conclusion of the first banquet parable, the “few” have become “many” coming from east and west, and the second parable depicts guests thronging into a banquet salon. This transformation is taken over associatively from the preceding parables of

³⁵¹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 224, 234-35; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 140; Hoffmann, “Redaktion und Tradition,” 196; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 213-14; Schenk, *Synopse*, 102.

³⁵² März, *Studien*, 98, 106; Hoffmann, “Redaktion und Tradition,” 197.

³⁵³ Piper, *Wisdom*, 109; März, *Studien*, 95-96; idem, “Q Rezeption,” 195.

³⁵⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 223.

³⁵⁵ März, *Studien*, 96; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 139.

the mustard seed and the leaven (13:18-21), which depict the wonder of the small becoming great. Q 13:24 translates the metaphors of mustard seed and leaven into the human-oriented terms of "few" and "many" trying to enter a door. In the course of the instruction, these "few" become the "many" of 13:29 and the hall full of guests in 14:16-24. The Enter the Narrow Door cluster, therefore, explicates the mustard seed and leaven parables in terms of the mysterious growth of the kingdom.³⁵⁶

With 13:25-29 we have before us a quite heterogeneous chain of materials which nonetheless works out, however raggedly, a narrative development of sorts. We shall look first at its constitutive units and then attempt to gain a panoramic view of the concatenated illustrative materials.

Verses 25-27 present intractable reconstructive problems, but it is clear from comparison of Matthew and Luke that some kind of vivid "Gerichtsdialog" in which a claim to a close relationship with Jesus is rejected (13:26-27), perhaps with a parabolic introduction (13:25), was present in Q.³⁵⁷ The rejection as super-

³⁵⁶ As März states, "few" likely expresses the "Minderheitserfahrung" of the Q group (*Studien*, 106).

³⁵⁷ März, *Studien*, 86, 99; Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 360. Both Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 224-25, note 217, and Hoffmann, "Redaktion und Tradition," 198, note the unevenness of the transition from 13:24 to 13:25. However, the shift in *Bildlogik* from the narrow door of 13:24 to the locked door of 13:25-27 sustains the idea of exclusion seminally present in 13:24 and represented as an ejection in 13:28-29. Moreover, it incorporates a clever development: the "narrow door" of 13:24 is now the "closed door" of 13:25, a contrast which heightens the sense of urgency. The strongest evidence for inclusion of 13:25 in Q and at this point is the reference to the οἰκοδοσπότης in 13:25 and in the parable of the Great Banquet (14:21) which, as März (*Studien*, 107, 112) suggests, may be evidence of the Q editor's desire to link the two parabolic units with a catchword. To this we can add that had it been Luke who inserted or created 13:25, the catchword connection would be wholly—and perhaps too—fortuitous, since Luke splits up and recontextualizes both parables and thus sees no elaborative connection between them worth preserving (see März, "Q Rezeption," 193). Once the connection with 14:16-24 is broken, as with Luke, there is little if any pretext for the redactional insertion of a reference to an οἰκοδοσπότης in the context of 13:24-30, and thus it is much more difficult to attribute it and 13:25 as a whole to Luke. März also argues that most of the material is so context-specific that it is hard to partition it out among different editors without the connections falling apart (*Studien*, 84-87, 107). As Kloppenborg points out (*Formation*, 225), it is possible to imagine 13:26-27 circulating as an independent prophetic threat. If this is the case, 13:25 may be a redactional creation of the Q-editor which does triple duty: connecting 13:26-

ficial or non-existent of a claim to a relationship with the "Lord" warns Jesus' contemporaries of the terrible consequences of an indifferent response to him (see 6:46-49). Like Q 12:8-9 and the Mission Instruction, Q 13:25-27 makes one's fate at judgment dependent upon one's decision with respect to Jesus.³⁵⁸ It thus functions as an argument from the contrary with respect to the opening admonition, which calls for a high level of dedication, as well as an elaboration on the motive clause of 13:24b, for it specifies the allusion to the future in 13:24b as being judgment, and it explains in a vivid manner why certain people who will try to enter will find the way barred against them—because they missed their opportunity to contract a close relationship with Jesus.³⁵⁹ In short, entering the narrow door is decoded in 13:25-27 as some form of adherence to Jesus. This illustrative unit thus inaugurates the process of moving from an aphoristic opening admonition to specific interpretation and application.

If the instruction is indeed directed apotropeically against indifference and preoccupation, then the audience for whom the instruction is intended does not consist of opponents who are attentive in an antagonistic manner to Jesus' message, but to a middling group of people too concerned about other things to take on the rigors of discipleship. They too draw down on themselves this threat of judgment, the purpose of which is to prod them into "entering the narrow door."³⁶⁰

Verses 28-29 widen the angle to include the image of a banquet in the kingdom of God, though the "we ate and drank with you" of verse 26 has already introduced this motif and the οἰκοδεσπότης of verse 25 its venue. These verses sustain both the illustrative nature of this section and the threat of judgment.³⁶¹ The reward for obeying the programmatic admonition, "Enter the narrow door," is now set forth positively as participation in the eschatological feast while simultaneously exclusion from that

27 with 13:24, preparing for the banquet-hall imagery of 13:28-29, and establishing a cross-cluster connection with the other banquet parable in 14:16-24.

³⁵⁸ Polag, *Christologie*, 120; März, "Q Rezeption," 184, 195-96; idem, *Studien*, 99; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 326, 426-27; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 235-36; Piper, *Wisdom*, 109-10.

³⁵⁹ März, *Studien*, 107; Piper, *Wisdom*, 109.

³⁶⁰ See Sato *Prophetie*, 426, and Piper, *Wisdom*, 109-10, 113-14.

³⁶¹ Sato, *Prophetie*, 137, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 227.

great event is employed as a threat. Though form-critically constituting a discrete unit, verses 28-29 are the last element of a quasi-narrative chain stretching back to 13:25.³⁶² The opening admonition refers to a door which though narrow still offers some chance of entry. In 13:25-27 this becomes a closed door, with the angle of vision broadened to include a house, people seeking to get in, and a dialogue with the master. Finally, 13:28-29 moves to the festive banqueting scene inside the house from which those outside are excluded. The climactic pronouncement of judgment occurs in 13:27b: "Away from me, evildoers!"; verses 28-29 then describe the paradisaical circumstances of those who gain entrance to the kingdom, while those excluded look in with some regret from their assigned place of judgment. It is likely, therefore, that despite the rockiness of the juxtapositions in 13:25-29, it constituted in Q a kind of concatenated parable which functioned as a threat of divine sanction to motivate obedience to the programmatic instruction.³⁶³

In the middle of the instruction we find a closely related pair of gnomic sayings, 13:30 and 14:11.³⁶⁴ When Lukan special material is removed and the Lukan transposition of 13:34-35 rectified, these two maxims are found to be juxtaposed in Q.³⁶⁵ The combination of ideas emerging from juxtaposition of 13:30 and 14:11 appears in Hesiod: "[Zeus] through whom mortal men are both dishonored and honored;/ they become famous and do not become famous as almighty Zeus wills./ Easily he strengthens the faltering, easily shatters the strong,/ easily makes the flourishing fade, the faded to flourish,/ easily straightens the

³⁶² See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 225. Besides the form-critical shape of the unit, the reference to those outside being "thrown out" (ἐκβαλλομένων ἔξω/ ἐκβληθήσονται) clashes with the previous depiction of them never being allowed to enter in the first place; see März, *Studien*, 120.

³⁶³ See Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 208, and Hoffmann, "Redaktion und Tradition," 204-207.

³⁶⁴ Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 9-10, 30; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 206; Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 173; Schenk, *Synopse*, 106.

³⁶⁵ Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 148, argues that because of the capacity of sayings of this type to flit from setting to setting the original Q location of 14:11 is uncertain. This transferability is, however, a property of all gnomic sayings and cannot be used as an argument against the present Q position of 14:11. See also Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 88-89; Piper, *Wisdom*, 151-53; Schürmann, "Redekomposition wider 'dieses Geschlecht'," 39; Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 162.

crooked and withers the haughty in spirit..." (*Works & Days*, 3-7).

The "last will be first..." saying makes a good aphoristic conclusion to 13:24-29, articulating gnominically the reversal of expectations expressed in the preceding units.³⁶⁶ Berger notes that contrastive gnomes are frequently appended to parables which depict a divine sanction.³⁶⁷ The maxim in 14:11 conjoins with 13:30 to produce a pattern not unlike that of 11:9-10, another set of middle-position paired gnomic sayings, and quite like that of the integrated yet distinct central sayings of the Judge Not instruction (6:40). Moreover, the two maxims taken *together* perform a coordinating function in the Enter Through the Narrow Door composition: 13:30 concludes the parable of 13:25-29 while 14:11 anticipates the parable of the Great Banquet in Q 14:16-24. The movement from "last" to "first" is reminiscent of the expansion from "small" to "great" in the immediately preceding parables of the mustard seed and leaven (13:18-21).³⁶⁸ The intervening parabolic material (13:25-27) describes a reversal of expectations at judgment, in which those who claim entry to the banquet find themselves on the outside.³⁶⁹ Verse 30 brings this motif of sudden status change home with gnomic succinctness and with proverbial certitude seals the fates of the respective groups depicted in the parable. The other maxim, 14:11, anticipates the contrast between the higher social status invitees and the lower social status guests in the parable of the Great Banquet (14:16-24). It functions similarly to 13:30 as gnomic confirmation of the point made by its cognate parable. The "humility" it enjoins anticipates the admonition to "bear the cross" contained in the cluster of aphorisms which conclude the instruction (14:27), forging a motif configuration similar to that in Phil 2:8: ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.

³⁶⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 227; Crossan, *In Fragments*, 44-45; März, *Studien*, 76-77, who points out that the gnome does not reflect Lukan redactional interests discernible in this section of Luke.

³⁶⁷ Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 64.

³⁶⁸ Q 13:30 also picks up the statement of the programmatic maxim of this entire section, Q 12:2: the "hidden" which will be "revealed" is the "last" becoming the "first", thus the manifestation of the Q group as the elect eschatological community.

³⁶⁹ See März, "Q Rezeption," 196.

Placed in the heart of the instruction, the two maxims knit its component parts together and together lend gnomic certitude to the events depicted in the two parabolic units which flank them. Thereby they infuse the programmatic admonition with gnomic legitimacy and thus motivate obedience to it: the "few" who enter the narrow gate are the "last" who will be "first"; "entering the narrow gate" is further specified as "humbling oneself" and is motivated with a promise of future exaltation. Together the two gnomes depict the reversal of the lowly status of those who enter the narrow gate as well as the sudden loss of status of those who currently enjoy a high position.³⁷⁰

Though the second banquet parable remains within the scenic world of everyday life, most scholars think that it invokes the eschatological banquet and that the invitation is a reference to the present crisis of decision initiated by Jesus.³⁷¹ This interpretation is corroborated by the intratextual connections of 14:16-24 with the parabolic material in 13:27-29 which refers unambiguously to the eschatological events of judgment and banquet.³⁷² The parable of the Great Banquet replicates the first parable's contrast between those who get inside and those who stay outside.³⁷³ Its central motif is forfeiture of place through casual indifference to a crucial message, also a feature of the first parable. Both parables, after depicting problems of access experienced by a first group of people who either make a futile claim to entry (13:26-27) or express indifference towards the invitation (14:16-20), describe an influx of new guests into their places.³⁷⁴ This exchange of places and reversal of status, as we noted, is the-

³⁷⁰ See Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 451-52, Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 66, von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 206, Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 14, and März, *Studien*, 110, who states that 13:30 describes "die eschatologische Umkehr aller Positionen...."

³⁷¹ Luise Schottroff, "Das Gleichnis vom großen Gastmahl in der Logienquelle," *EvT* 47 (1987) 192-211, esp. 197, 202; März, *Studien*, 98, 101; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 229; Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear Then The Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 172.

³⁷² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 229.

³⁷³ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 220.

³⁷⁴ Schottroff, "Gastmahl," 198; März, *Studien*, 93, 98. März states in reference to 14:16-24: "...das Gericht über die Ersteingeladenen eben in der Einladung von Ersatzgästen bestand" (93); similarly Dennis E. Smith, "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke," *JBL* 106 (1987) 613-38, esp. 627.

matized gnomically by the paired sayings, 13:30 and 14:11, which coordinate these banquet parables.

Differences between the two units should not be obscured: the second parable develops around the idea of an issued invitation.³⁷⁵ As such it focuses upon the present—on those rejecting as well as accepting the invitation—to a greater degree than the first parable, which spells out the future consequence—disqualification. In this respect the parable of the Great Banquet elaborates the programmatic admonition (13:24). “Enter through the narrow door” is repackaged as an invitation to a banquet, and the danger of exclusion expressed in 13:24b reappears in the disqualification of the first-invited guests.³⁷⁶

Though the drama and personae of the second parable are readily applicable to events in church history such as the failure to convert Israel and the mission to the Gentiles or to delineation of moral boundaries such as that between “tax collectors and sinners” and the pious,³⁷⁷ it is striking how lacking the Q parable is in signals that it is meant to have such theological referents or to depict metaphorically a social history of early Christianity.³⁷⁸ Schottroff points out that no tradition justifies identifying those invited from the “streets” with the Gentiles, or those preoccupied with concerns of property with Israel.³⁷⁹ Such indicators as there are describe social-economic relations and social stratification.³⁸⁰ The double tradition versions as well as *Gos. Thom.* 64 in one way or another associate the first group of invited guests with property, possessions, homes, and marriage (indicators of stable social life), and present these commitments as hindrances to participation in the banquet. The first invitees are able to enlarge land holdings, purchase several head of live-

³⁷⁵ Schottroff, “Gastmahl,” 197.

³⁷⁶ See März, *Studien*, 77.

³⁷⁷ For example, Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 400.

³⁷⁸ Willi Braun, “The Use of Mediterranean Banquet Traditions in Luke 14:1-24,” Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1993, 136, 158-62, devastatingly critiques this allegorical approach to the parable characteristic of much scholarship.

³⁷⁹ Schottroff, “Gastmahl,” 207-208.

³⁸⁰ See Horsley, “Social Conflict,” 43, 53, and especially Braun, “Banquet Traditions,” 138-39, 151-52, whose description of how this story, particularly in its Lukan form, rotates around social and economic polarities and contrasts in social status is difficult to improve upon.

stock, and contract marriages (Luke, *Thomas*). Further, they are likely of the same social class as the man able to throw the "great banquet."³⁸¹ The location of the second group of guests is described by all three versions as the "streets" (Matthew, "by-roads"). This word sets up a striking contrast with the first invitees, for it invokes a constellation of ideas including transience, social instability, homelessness, infirmity, and beggary, in a word, poverty.³⁸² The excuses of the first group of guests relate to the necessity of maintaining and expanding property and meeting normal social obligations.³⁸³ An implicit moral question arises in relation to the contrast of these propertied people and their pre-occupations with another group of people—those to be found on the street. Jesus passes judgment on this state of affairs when, against all expectations, the poor are included in the banquet and the well-off excluded. Like the Do Not Be Anxious instruction, therefore, this parable, and hence the whole Enter Through the Narrow Door instruction, promises the kingdom—and provision of food—to the poor, while simultaneously warning the rich that the diverting influence of their riches can have catastrophic results. And finally, as the central gnome 14:11 predicts, the parable shows the lowly poor occupying the place at the banquet normally reserved for those of the host's social class.³⁸⁴

A short chain of four aphorisms makes up the final unit of this instruction. Within this group, 14:26-27, 17:33 have a particularly close relationship.³⁸⁵ These three sayings all thematize discipleship, describing its difficult demands and high cost, with the third in the chain (17:33) linking acceptance of a difficult discipleship, which may include death, with life. We can see this,

³⁸¹ Moxnes, *Economy of the Kingdom*, 57; Schottroff, "Gastmahl," 200-201, 204-206. Richard L. Rohrbaugh, "The Pre-industrial City in Luke-Acts: Urban Social Relations," in *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. Jerome H. Neyrey (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 125-49, esp. 142-43, notes that landowners typically resided in the city.

³⁸² Schottroff, "Gastmahl," 201, 207-208; Rohrbaugh, "Pre-Industrial City," 144-45.

³⁸³ Schottroff, "Gastmahl," 206; Rohrbaugh, "Pre-Industrial City, 142-43.

³⁸⁴ Schottroff, "Gastmahl," 198; Rohrbaugh, "Pre-Industrial City," 144.

³⁸⁵ For discussion of the tradition-history of the combination of these sayings see Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 331-35, Crossan, *In Fragments*, 136, Harry T. Fleddermann, "The Cross and Discipleship in Q," in *SBLSP 27*, ed. David Lull (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 472-82, esp. 482, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 231-32, and Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 225.

therefore, as a small instruction on discipleship with 14:26-27 constituting the demands and 17:33 functioning as a kind of sanction and promise motive clause.³⁸⁶ As such this three-maxim chain functions as the closing admonition of the instruction. Moreover, it unambiguously interprets the opening admonition, "Enter through the narrow door," as an admonition to accept the yoke of discipleship and the narrowness of the door as the difficulties of that vocation. In so doing it makes a specific application of both the opening admonition and of the instruction as a whole, topping it off with a promise.³⁸⁷ These calls to discipleship form a framework around the two parables and the reversal of status gnomes. The framework admonitions thus articulate the conditions for inclusion in the banquet: following Jesus and acceptance of the difficulties that entails. The internal parabolic units in turn criticize the alternative to the commitment demanded in the framework: indifference to Jesus' message. Hence this cluster of heterogeneous traditions turns out to be a finely configured and delicately nuanced protreptic instruction.³⁸⁸

The salt saying is a cumulative maxim which epitomizes the themes of the instruction. The insipid nature of useless salt may be a figurative way of expressing the indifferent response to Jesus criticized by the parabolic units as well as a derogatory characterization of the quality of a life monopolized by the horizontal demands of property and social conventions. It closes with a threat: insipid salt is thrown out (ἐξω βάλλουσιν αὐτό) just as those who did not take Jesus' message seriously were thrown out (ἐκβληθήσεσθε) of the eschatological banquet.³⁸⁹

Taken together, therefore, the discipleship sayings (14:26-27,

³⁸⁶ Von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 206; Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 225; see also Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 446.

³⁸⁷ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 432; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 332; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 352; Schenk, *Synopse*, 109-11; Fleddermann, "Cross and Discipleship," 482; all recognise that 14:26-27; 17:33 constitute a call to discipleship. Kloppenborg is the only Q scholar to my knowledge who has discerned the connection of 14:26-27, 17:33 back to the opening admonition (*Formation*, 237).

³⁸⁸ *Wis* 1:1-6:21 follows a similar compositional strategy: the framework units are instructions to rulers to pursue justice and wisdom; the units of the main body describe a reversal of status through judgment by which the righteous come to be exalted over the wicked. See below, chapter four.

³⁸⁹ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 234. Piper, *Wisdom*, 131, notes that the odd image of salt becoming saltless is paralleled by another maxim which like this one brings closure to a Q instruction: 11:35, light becoming darkness.

17:33) and the salt saying (14:34-35) reiterate the major themes of the instruction, with 14:26-27; 17:33 picking up the framework theme of commitment to discipleship—what it takes to get “in”—and 14:34-35 picking up the indifference and exclusion motifs of the parabolic units—what it takes to be “out”—while at the same time providing a concluding motivating sanction for the entire speech.

Discerning the Day of the Son of Man (17:23-37)

Because this instruction displays obvious topical cohesion, it has not attracted too much redaction-history analysis. A. Y. Collins speaks of “expansion” from the basic kernel of 17:23-24 in two stages: first, the addition of the “corpse” saying (17:37b), then the addition of the “Noah” example (17:26-27).³⁹⁰ Schürmann suggests an early combination of 17:23-24, in turn supplemented by 17:26-30. Since this latter unit does not illustrate the apocalyptic parousia of the Son of Man as depicted in 17:24, but represents it as “a judgment on secularized humanity,” an alleged tension emerges which justifies positing this as a secondary expansion. At a “pre-Lukan or a Lukan stage” the sayings in 17:34-35, 37 were added.³⁹¹ However, with regard to the relationship of 17:26-30 to 17:23-24, the latter is so figurative and open-ended that it seems better to take the illustrative material in 17:26-30 as elaborative rather than discrepant. Kloppenborg agrees with Schürmann only in so far as 17:23-24 is seen as forming “the crystallization point” for the cluster, since “the order in which the rest of the sayings were added cannot be determined with any certainty.”³⁹²

Crossan calls 17:24-30 “a formal cluster of three *apocalyptic comparisons*.”³⁹³ Laufen suggests a partition into three groups: 17:23-24, 37b treat the unforeseeable nature of the Son of Man’s coming, 17:26-27 utilize examples to illustrate both the suddenness of his coming and the unpreparedness of humanity, and 17:34-35 show that his coming will bring separation among human

³⁹⁰ A. Y. Collins, “Son of Man Sayings,” 380.

³⁹¹ Schürmann, “Son of Man Title,” 88-89.

³⁹² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 164.

³⁹³ Crossan, *In Fragments*, 179.

beings.³⁹⁴ Kloppenborg divides up the cluster in a similar manner.³⁹⁵ Though these descriptions are quite apt, one notes that the “lightning” metaphor carries the ideas of both suddenness and unexpectedness. This indicates rather the programmatic function of 17:23-24 and the elaborative, concretizing function of subsequent units. Catchpole suggests that 17:23-24, 26-30 follow the pattern of a general heading followed by two illustrations.³⁹⁶ However, this does not account for 17:34-35, 37b. In Zmijewski’s view, the Noah example forms the center of the cluster, with 17:23-24, 37b on one side, and 17:34-35 on the other. Its central position gives due emphasis to its function to illustrate the main themes of the cluster.³⁹⁷ Assigning an emphatic position to 17:26-27, however, does not adequately take into consideration the fact that it is but one member of a pair of illustrative units in the cluster, the second being 17:34-35.

Despite still unresolved problems regarding the Q-status of the Lot example (17:28-29),³⁹⁸ when seen as follows, 17:23-37 displays a compositional arrangement not unlike that of other Q-instructions:

<i>Programmatic Admonition</i> (23):	And if they say to you, ‘Look, he is in the wilderness,’ do not go out; ‘Look, he is in the inner rooms,’ do not follow them.
<i>Reason</i> (24):	For as the lightning comes from the east

³⁹⁴ Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 370.

³⁹⁵ Kloppenborg, “Symbolic Eschatology,” 301-302.

³⁹⁶ Catchpole, “Law and Prophets,” 105.

³⁹⁷ Josef Zmijewski, *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums: Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 21,5-36 und Lk 17,20-37*, BBB 40 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1972), 521-22.

³⁹⁸ Despite the long roster of scholars convinced that the Lot example (17:28-29) belongs in Q (see Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 193-94), the IQP oddly decides with apparent certitude that it does not. One might have thought that it at least merited double brackets or a question mark. Volume editor Stanley D. Anderson informed me that the status of 17:28-29 has never been adequately treated in a database and evaluation and that the IQP’s exclusion of it “was not an informed decision” (personal communication, February 19, 1996). For a summary of arguments for its inclusion see Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 194. To the authors in favor of its inclusion we can add Catchpole, “Law and Prophets,” 102, who notes that the pairing of Noah and Lot is conventional in Jewish literature (*Wis* 10:3-4, 6-8; *Sir* 16:7-8; *3 Macc* 2:4, 5; *Jub* 20:5-6; *T. Naph.* 3:4; 4:16; 3:5; *Sanh.* 10:3; see also Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 74-83), and takes particular note of the Sodom and judgment by fire references elsewhere in Q (3:7-9, 16-17; 10:12, to which we could add 12:49).

and shines as far as the west, thus will be the day of the Son of Man.

Examples (26-30)

For as were the days of Noah, so will it also be in the days of the Son of Man. They were eating, drinking, marrying, given in marriage, until the day Noah entered the ark and the flood came and took them all.

[Likewise as it was in the days of Lot. They ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they built, but on the day when Lot left Sodom fire and sulfur rained from heaven and destroyed them all.]

So will it be on the day the Son of Man [is revealed].

Examples (34-35):

I tell you, there will be two on one couch; one is taken and one is left. Two women will be grinding at the mill, one is taken and one is left.

Final Maxim (37b):

Where the corpse is, there the eagles will be gathered together

The opening admonition and reason clause pose the programmatic issues to be addressed by the instruction: correct discernment, and, relatedly, the "how" and "where" of the coming of the Son of Man.³⁹⁹ The combination of opening admonition + reason clause (17:23-24) is a conventional threshold structure of an instruction.⁴⁰⁰ The lightning saying in particular is a highly figurative *Bildwort*.⁴⁰¹ Taken together they stand in need of clarification and specific elaboration to draw out their meaning.⁴⁰² Because the Son of Man saying in 17:24 supplies a rationale for

³⁹⁹ Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 373; Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 521.

⁴⁰⁰ Noting the combination are Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 374, Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 414, Sato, *Prophetie*, 214, Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Der eschatologische Abschnitt Lukas 17,20-37," in Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Schriften zum Neuen Testament* (Münich: Kösel, 1971), 220-43, esp. 230, and Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 281.

⁴⁰¹ Ruthild Geiger, *Die Lukanischen Endzeitreden. Studien zur Eschatologie des Lukas-evangeliums*, Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII 16 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1973), 74.

⁴⁰² Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 369; see also A. Y. Collins, "Son of Man Sayings," 379.

the admonition of 17:23, which appears to warn against messianic pretenders, the connection of the two sayings is editorial.⁴⁰³ This opening combination bears more than just a passing resemblance to Q 11:29-30, the opening of the Request for a Sign cluster: both treat issues of identity and visible manifestations, both place a Son of Man saying in the second, rationale position, and both are followed by a bipartite illustrative section using paradigms drawn from sacred history.

The opening admonition (17:23) raises the problem of the location and manner of the appearance of the end time agent of God, stating that he is not to be sought in a terrestrial locale. The rationale clause (17:24), figurative though it may be, states the positive alternative to the incorrect view: the agent of God will appear, like lightning, from heaven. This constitutes the programmatic heart of the cluster. The programmatic threshold forbids and precludes expectations being directed toward other earthly claimants. Rather it claims for the heavenly Son of Man the role of God's decisive end time agent.⁴⁰⁴ Thereby the Q group makes a protreptic claim for its particularistic version of conventional expectations for some end time agent figure.⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 160; see also Geiger, *Endzeitreden*, 64, who labels 17:24 a *Begründung* to the admonition of 17:23.

⁴⁰⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 160-64; idem, "Symbolic Eschatology, 302, brings out the heaven-earth contrast which controls this opening unit. Most other scholars see 17:23-24 as constituting an admonition against following false messiahs: Sato, *Prophetie*, 214, 216; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 372-73; Schnackenburg, "Eschatologische Abschnitt," 230; Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 416, 521-22; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 284.

⁴⁰⁵ Some others: the "new priest" raised up after a period of severe moral lapse in Israel (*T. Lev.* 18:1-14); royal agent from Judah who will "save the race of Israel" and "assemble the righteous from among the nations" (*T. Naph.* 8:2-3; see also *T. Jud.* 24:1-6; *T. Jos.* 19:11; *T. Ben.* 11:2; *T. Dan.* 5:9-13; *T. Gad.* 8:1-2; *T. Sim.* 7:1-3); the "unique prophet" arising after a time of moral degeneracy in Israel (*T. Ben.* 9:1-3); "my son the Messiah shall be revealed..." who ends an age of evil (*4 Ezra* 7:26-35); the "lion, aroused out of the forest, roaring" who reproves the (Roman) "eagle" and ends its reign (*4 Ezra* 11:36-37), and who "will deliver the remnant of my people" (12:34); the man arising from the troubled sea who flies with the clouds of heaven, also described as "my son" who "will be revealed," and who from a mountain incinerates a hostile multitude of the nations and regathers the ten tribes (*4 Ezra* 13:1-58). *Test. Mos.* and *Jub* 1:15-18, 27-28 construct an eschatological finale in which God acts directly to bring an end to wickedness, relieve the suffering of the righteous, and establish a righteous kingdom. In the former God's intervention is in response to the suffering of the righteous; in the latter God restores Israel

Though the "lightning" metaphor evokes suddenness, unexpectedness, visibility, and in effect redirects the eyes from earth to sky, the polyvalency of the lightning image requires further elaboration, provided by the following units.⁴⁰⁶ The Noah and the Lot stories are exempla or paradigms which use figures from the past to elucidate a moral issue presently under deliberation and in the current context function as warnings of judgment.⁴⁰⁷ Despite their focus on judgment, however, they are components of the cluster's deliberative argumentation. First, they are calculated to convince of the truth of the programmatic admonition by interpreting the present situation on analogy with past crises recorded in sacred history. Second, the threats of judgment are intended to motivate those who hear to prepare themselves for the onset of the day of the Son of Man.⁴⁰⁸

Both examples make reference to judgments which fell from the skies and thus elaborate upon 17:23. Even as judgment from heaven in the form of rain and fire respectively came unexpectedly upon the contemporaries of Noah and Lot, so the day of the Son of Man will bring catastrophic judgment from heaven upon the contemporaries of the Q group, falling upon them in the midst of their daily pursuits. Notably, the contemporaries of Noah and Lot are not charged by Q with sinful activities but with failure to discern the critical nature of the times.⁴⁰⁹ The hapless antedeluvians ignored the announcement of judgment, and the men of Sodom failed to discern the significance of the

after his people return to the faithful study and practice of the law after having fallen to a nadir of decrepitude (23:26-31).

⁴⁰⁶ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 124; Polag, *Christologie*, 96; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 164; Sato, *Prophetie*, 214; Catchpole, "Law and Prophets," 105, who suggests that "lightning" connotes sudden judgment (appealing to the context in which this motif frequently appears in Jewish literature), and concludes that so taken 17:24 forms an apt heading to the Noah and Lot examples which follow it.

⁴⁰⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 161; Sato, *Prophetie*, 285.

⁴⁰⁸ Piper, *Wisdom*, 183; Schenk, *Synopse*, 122, who points out that other Jewish wisdom and paraenetic literature uses the examples of Noah and Lot for similar ends (citing *Sir* 16:17, *Wis* 10:4, 6; *T. Naph.* 3:4).

⁴⁰⁹ Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology," 302; Tödt, *Son of Man*, 50; Catchpole, "Law and Prophets," 103; Piper, *Wisdom*, 142; Sato, *Prophetie*, 285; Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 433-34, 461; Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 119-21; Geiger, *Endzeitreden*, 95-96.

messengers who came to town.⁴¹⁰ Thus the indicator of the present crisis is the preaching of Jesus and after him of the Q group itself. Here Q 17:23-37 stands in continuity with other Q passages, particularly in this last section, which criticize complacency and argue that Jesus' activities and preaching are the signs of the times (11:20; 11:29-35; 12:16-21; 12:49-59; 13:25-27; 14:16-24).

Verse 30 is the third occurrence in this cluster of a stock phrase which follows the basic form: "thus it will be on the day of the Son of Man," and accordingly it concludes the third round of a serialization of eschatological correlative sayings (verses 24, 26, 30). Specifically, it relates the Noah and Lot examples to the programmatic statements standing at the beginning, rearticulating the major theme of the composition: the characterization of the day of the Son of Man. Though by no means an independent saying, verse 30 has an autonomous prominence within the cluster which goes beyond its function as the correlating conclusion of the preceding examples. Its pointed reference to revelation (ἀποκαλύπτεται; bracketed because absent in Matthew) appropriates the theme enunciated by 12:2, the programmatic maxim for the last section of Q: οὐδὲν κεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται. The addition of "is revealed" refers back to and explicates the metaphorical "as lightning flashes and lights up the sky..." of the programmatic maxim (17:24). Though verse 30 is not structurally linked to what follows, its reiteration of the major motif of the cluster establishes the context for the examples of men at table and women grinding (17:34-35), which graphically describe the horrible separations among humanity that day will entail, as well as for the "eagle" metaphor of the closing maxim, which together with the "corpse" image depicts the arrival of the Son of Man and the judgment which attends his manifestation. Verse 30 bears some resemblance to 12:40, the central saying of the Be Watchful and Ready instruction: "You also must be ready, for the Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not

⁴¹⁰ Catchpole, "Law and Prophets," 103, notes that in Josephus, *Ant* 1.74; Philo, *QuestGen* 1:91; 2:13; *Tg. Onkelos Gen* 6:3; *Tg. Pseudo-Jonathan Gen* 6:3; 19:24; *Tg. Neofiti I Gen* 18:21, "the days of Noah and the days of Lot were days of opportunity for repentance....the *Sitz im Leben* of Luke 17:26-30 thus emerges as the preaching of near judgment and for repentance and to the unrestricted general public." See also Schottroff, "Wanderprophetinnen," 333-34.

expect.” This supports the notion that both clusters employ a similar compositional strategy: in the Be Watchful and Ready instruction (12:35-46), a metaphorical opening admonition, “Let your belts be fastened and your lamps burning,” is explicated in the center, “You also must be ready; for the Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect,” a saying in turn flanked by two illustrative sections.

Verses 34-35 portray in two vivid images—two men reclining at table and two women grinding grain—the sudden, unexpected sundering of the closest social bonds which occurs with the manifestation of the Son of Man and the accompanying separation of the elect from the doomed.⁴¹¹ These images thus depict themes articulated metaphorically and aphoristically in the programmatic opening: the unexpectedness, suddenness, and universal effect of judgment. The unit, though descriptive, constitutes a threat of judgment.⁴¹² However, it has been incorporated into the instructional framework genre where it functions as a motivation to heed the opening admonition, namely, to obtain salvation from impending judgment by allying oneself with the end time agent of God, the Son of Man, advocated by the Q group. Schnackenburg states, “Das Doppelbild von V. 34f...wird im Kontext zur Mahnung, bereit zu sein und sich retten zu lassen.”⁴¹³

Verses 34-35 form a counterpart to the Noah-Lot examples in 17:26-29. Both sections concretize the opening metaphor of “lightning” by depicting judgment suddenly striking and interrupting the normal course of human activities. Both feature, explicitly or implicitly, the image of eating and drinking.⁴¹⁴ Both units contrast those who are saved with those who perish and depict the separation of the elect from the damned.⁴¹⁵ Verses 34-35 focus

⁴¹¹ Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 501; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 163-64; idem, “Symbolic Eschatology,” 302; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 212; Sato, *Prophetie*, 139.

⁴¹² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 162-63; Sato, *Prophetie*, 139; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 282. Sato wishes to make its presence an indicator of the prophetic nature of Q, especially because (allegedly), “es gibt keine ethische Bedingung, bloß das Faktum des kommenden Unheils liegt vor.” But it lacks deliberative focus only if looked at in isolation.

⁴¹³ Schnackenburg, “Abschnitt,” 238.

⁴¹⁴ Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 493-94; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 203-204.

⁴¹⁵ Kloppenborg, “Symbolic Eschatology,” 303, says in reference to 17:34-35, “In Q, as in the LXX story of Lot, ἀφίημι means ‘to spare’ (Gen 18:26)

on the severing of personal bonds while verses 26-29 maintain a panoramic view of the destruction of entire societies.

Despite the pall of judgment which hangs over these example sections, both have strong affinities to wisdom. In 17:26-29, 34-35 we see again the idiosyncratic twist Q puts on traditional wisdom. Conventional wisdom supports and lends success to the performance of the normal cycles of human life and sustains the normative social order. It instructs on such topics as eating, drinking, hospitality, marriage, agricultural work, and friendship. Q's wisdom, by contrast, makes shards out of these normative structures, yet offers wisdom for living life astutely in light of the present crisis of impending judgment.⁴¹⁶ Wisdom admonitions to correctly assess the times and seasons and act accordingly are at least as old as Hesiod. Hence the wisdom tone of 17:23-37 is pervasive, even if played in reverse.

This instruction ends with a cumulative maxim, 17:37b: "Where the corpse is, there the eagles will be gathered together." Despite the fact that the Greco-Roman rhetoricians recommended the use of maxims in the final position "to put the crowning touch on the argument,"⁴¹⁷ many scholars prefer this maxim in its Matthean location, which would place it directly after 17:23-24, and argue that Luke transposed it, though the IQP evaluator acknowledges that "no consensus regarding the logion's original place [is] in sight."⁴¹⁸ Arguments for the Matthean order include: (1) similarity between the lightning saying and the eagle-corpse saying, which, so it is (fallaciously) argued, indicates original contiguity, (2) Lukan redaction in verse 37a, the effect of which is to render the saying less obscure, which in turn suggests (so it is argued) that Luke transposed it from its more perspicuous position after verse 24, (3) the Lukan passion insertion (17:25) may have moved in to fill the gap left by the transposition, or was

and (συν)παραλαμβάνω means 'to sweep away' (Gen 19:17)." If the Lot example (17:28-29) were in Q, then this precise description of the different fates in 17:34-35 would allude directly to the LXX version of that story. See also Geiger, *Endzeitreden*, 140.

⁴¹⁶ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 318-19, and Perdue, "Social Character of Paraenesis," 5-39.

⁴¹⁷ Carruth, "Persuasion," 158, citing Quintilian 5.11.37; 8.5.10, and Lausberg, *Handbuch*, §872.

⁴¹⁸ Heinz Guenther, "Database and Evaluation Q 7:37b," *Documenta Q*, 1-23, esp. 6, cited in typescript.

the pretext for the transposition, (4) Luke wished to avoid an unseemly association of the Son of Man with carrion birds and corpses, and thus removed it from its proximity to 17:24, and (5) the saying is so enigmatic that it is unsuitable either as a climax to the passage or as commentary on 17:34-35. The *ad hoc* nature and reversibility of these arguments are shown by arguments against the Matthean order, such as: (1) the Q (Lukan) order was obscure to Matthew, so he juxtaposed it with 17:24 to render it perspicuous; (2) 17:37a is simply Luke highlighting the climactic nature of the saying in Q; (3) the theme of imminent judgment is ubiquitous in Q, and thus the significance of the saying is obvious.⁴¹⁹ The argument that "both Q 17:24 and 17:37b concern visible heavenly phenomena and thus belong together as a double-saying" is not convincing.⁴²⁰ As Geiger points out, structurally they are too divergent to be classified technically as *Doppelbildworte*.⁴²¹ Moreover, because the whole instruction is dedicated to defining judgment as a sudden, heaven to earth intervention, gnomic sayings expressing this motif can theoretically appear anywhere within it. Accordingly, the end position of the maxim does not render it obscure because the intervening material has established an unambiguous framework for its interpretation. That Luke transposed 17:37b in order to insert 17:25 does not work as a decisive argument because (a) he inserts a passion prediction in 12:50 without thereby transposing a Q saying, and (b) Luke could have simply bumped 17:37b down a notch when inserting 17:25 instead of transposing it to the end of the instruction. The argument that Luke found the eagle-corpse comparison with the Son of Man unseemly is predicated upon a conjecture about Luke's feelings, and it is hard to know how much probative force to give such considerations. The position of the maxim, by virtue of its integration with the cluster, in any case does not permit it to escape association with the Son of Man saying. With regard to the Lukan introduction (17:37a), Luke elsewhere inserts similar introductions without disturbing the Q order, for example, in Q 6:39a and 12:54a, so

⁴¹⁹ Guenther, "Database," 6.

⁴²⁰ Cited by Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 194.

⁴²¹ Geiger, *Endzeitreden*, 73-74.

the presence of one here has no probative value either way.⁴²² Matthew was obviously satisfied with a location after 17:23-24, but it must be borne in mind that he in a more thorough-going manner than Luke has created a fresh context for the entire instruction, namely, one in which false prophets lead many astray, and it is possible that he uses the maxim to reflect this decaying situation rather than as a comment upon the manner of the coming of the Son of Man.⁴²³ Alternatively, Matthew's disassembling of this Q instruction and the corresponding loss of context for 17:37b may have led him to juxtapose it with 17:24 in order to preserve its significance.

Again, genre and compositional considerations provide help with regard to intractable reconstructive problems such as this one. From the point of view of those conventions, the Matthean position of 17:37b is anomalous.⁴²⁴ Though not impossible it is unusual to find one highly figurative maxim (17:24) followed immediately by an equally or even more figurative maxim (17:37b). The tendency followed quite regularly in Q is to begin to clear up the haziness of enigmatic opening maxims or admonitions with explicatory units, and where one maxim-type saying follows upon another (as in 12:2-3), the second begins to unfold the first in more direct terms. Moreover, it is not unusual for instructional speeches to be concluded by cumulative final maxims. Q employs several such final maxims, or aphorisms, which are obscure only if viewed in isolation from the materials that precede them. This is the case with 7:23, "Blessed is the one not offended in me," 7:28, "Among those born of women there is none greater than John, yet the least in the kingdom of God is greater than he," 7:35, "Wisdom is justified by all her children,"⁴²⁵ 11:23, "The one who is not with me is against me, and the one who does not gather with me scatters," 11:26, "The last state is worse than the first," 11:35, "If the light in you is darkness, how great is that darkness!", 12:34, "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also," (structurally identical

⁴²² See Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 302.

⁴²³ See Polag, *Christologie*, 95.

⁴²⁴ It is not anomalous within the fresh Matthean composition, since Matthew has disassembled Q's instructional speech in the course of composing his chapter 24.

⁴²⁵ On the Q 7 compositions see below, chapter four.

to 17:37b: ὅπου...ἐκεῖ//ὅπου...ἐκεῖ), 14:34-35, "Salt is good, but if salt becomes insipid, with what will it be seasoned?...", and 19:26, "To everyone who has will more be given; but from him who has not, even what he has will be taken away." In light of the above, it can be said that *maxims or aphorisms in the final position are a recurrent feature of Q composition*.⁴²⁶ In each case the preceding sequence of instructional materials serves to hermeneutically direct otherwise opaque final aphorisms. This is the case with 17:37b. The preceding illustrative units depicting a society dedicated to destruction render the "corpse" image comprehensible; more specifically, the bird of prey (or scavenger) image of 17:37b is particularly apposite to the "snatching away" in judgment depicted in the *second* example section (17:34-35).⁴²⁷ Conversely, the *first* example section with its allusions to rainstorms, floods, and fire from heaven (17:26-29) is particularly appropriate to the "lightning" maxim (17:24). Verse 37b supplies, therefore, specific gnomic commentary on 17:34-35—the birds swoop down and rip away carrion in a manner anticipatory of the Son of Man's judgment. This function is seriously impaired if the aphorism is transposed to a position adjacent to 17:24 where it can only interfere with the excellent lightening-rain-flood-fire connection between 17:24 and 17:26-29.⁴²⁸ Its juxtaposition with 17:34-35, and by extension 17:26-29, serves to depict society, whose normal rounds are described in those illustrative units, as ripe for destruction just as carrion is for being consumed.⁴²⁹ As such the gnome functions as yet another threat of judgment,⁴³⁰ but set in a deliberative context where it is calculated to motivate the decision advocated by the opening admonition.⁴³¹

⁴²⁶ We can compare *Ps.-Phoc.* 96, the concluding maxim of lines 79-96, "...for people and water and fire are ever uncontrollable," an open-ended gnome which, however, makes perfect sense in view of the material which precedes it.

⁴²⁷ See Schnackenburg, "Abschnitt," 234, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 161-62.

⁴²⁸ Q 13:30 and 14:11 in an identical manner serve as gnomic commentaries upon parabolic, illustrative sections, with 13:30 in the final position and 14:11 in the opening position with respect to their parabolic units (13:25-29; 14:16-24 respectively).

⁴²⁹ Zeller, *Kommentar*, 90; Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 51; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 308; Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 509.

⁴³⁰ Sato, *Prophetie*, 145.

⁴³¹ Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 305, states, "Auch der eindrucksvolle Schluß V. 37

Invoking closure with a maxim is certainly not anomalous for an instructional speech, but neither is a final threat of divine sanction. Berger states, "Eine längere Rede auf diese Weise zu beenden, entspricht der drastischen Eigenart der antiken peroratio."⁴³² Moreover, verse 37b functions cumulatively. The inevitability by which certain birds are attracted to carrion and the suddenness with which they appear express the inevitability and suddenness of the judgment which runs as an undercurrent through all the units of this instruction.⁴³³ The images of the final maxim reflect those of the opening "lightning" maxim of 17:24, forming, therefore, a kind of inclusio: the scenes of lightning flashing across the earth and the bird diving to its carrion make use of a heaven to earth axis of movement, and both represent the manner of the Son of Man's manifestation;⁴³⁴ moreover, in antiquity lightning and birds were two common portents of future events. Both 17:24 and 17:37b answer the question raised by the opening admonition about the "where" and "how" of the appearance of God's agent. He will come from heaven and be visible to all. In this respect the final maxim brings closure to the instruction by returning to the opening admonition.

The tense character of this instruction, focused as it is on future events and repeated references to judgment, has produced a diversity of opinion over whether it can be classified as instructional (wisdom, paraenetic) discourse or is better understood as prophetic, and whether it is directed to the community or to outsiders. Schnackenburg captures the dilemma well: "Das Ganze liest sich wie eine prophetische Ansage des plötzlichen und unerwartet hereinbrechenden Tages des Menschensohns und eine durch die atl. Beispiele und die lebendigen Bilder aus dem Alltag verstärkte Mahnung: Seid bereit; denn der Menschensohn kommt...."⁴³⁵

weist nur auf die Gnadenlosigkeit des Gerichtes, die zur Entscheidung jetzt ermuntern soll."

⁴³² Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 72-73.

⁴³³ Tödt, *Son of Man*, 50; Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 304-305; Sato, *Prophetie*, 44; Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 516.

⁴³⁴ Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 511, Catchpole, "Law and Prophets," 104, and Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology," 302; A. Y. Collins, "Son of Man Sayings," 379.

⁴³⁵ Schnackenburg, "Abschnitt," 237. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 165-66; idem, "Response," 211, argues that the speech moves beyond the boundaries of paraenesis and constitutes a prophetic announcement of judgment to outsiders. Catch-

The instructional nature of the speech should no longer be in doubt. Despite the heat and volatility of the threats of judgment, the opening admonition + rationale establishes the framework genre of the speech as being instructional and deliberative, and the elaborative body uses a mixture of gnomes, aphorisms, paradigms, and examples from daily life to secure the argument and gain adherence to the programmatic admonition. To be sure, the speech's arguments are predicated upon the reality of future judgment, but the appearance of this motif does not move the speech out of the generic confines of paraenesis. Berger states that in 17:23-37, "die symbuleutischen Elemente überwiegen noch stärker als in den synoptischen Apokalypsen Mk 13parr. Alle Aussagen über Zukünftiges werden sogleich in Mahnrede umgemünzt."⁴³⁶ Threats of judgment regularly appear in instructions of all sorts to provoke obedience to the moral issue at stake.

Though elsewhere in Q the community is threatened with judg-

pole, "Law and Prophets," 103, likewise sees the speech as directed towards the contemporaries of the Q sect, though he emphasizes the instructional nature of the constitutive units of the speech. Horsley, "Logoi Propheton," 205-206, takes the speech as a community-directed set of sanctions; similarly Zmijewski, *Eschatologiereden*, 461.

⁴³⁶ Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 305. An example of the centering of a specific instruction around the prospect of a future catastrophe is found in a piece of deliberative rhetoric formulated by Herodotus (VII 140, 2-3). The speaker is the Delphic Oracle, who is urging the abandonment of Athens in the face of the imminent invasion by Xerxes:

Admonition: "Wretches, why tarry ye thus? Nay, flee from your houses and city, flee to the ends of the earth from the circle embattled of Athens!

Motives: Body and head are alike, nor one is stable nor other
 Hands and feet wax faint, and whatso lieth between them
 Wasteth in darkness and gloom; for flame destroyeth the city,
 Flame and the War-god fierce, swift driver of Syrian horses.
 Many a fortress too, not thine alone, shall he shatter;
 Many a shrine of the gods he'll give to the flame for devouring;
 Sweating for fear they stand, and quaking for dread of the foeman,
 Running with gore are their roofs, foreseeing the stress of their sorrow;

Admonition: Wherefore I bid you begone! Have courage to lighten your evil." Beck, *Ringkomposition*, 75, comments on this passage, "Insbesondere hat die Begründung durch die Voraussage der Zukunft überzeugenden Wert, wenn es sich um Mahnung handelt....Die Glaubwürdigkeit, die der Befehl des Orakels von sich aus fordert, wird erhöht, indem seine Begründung das Kommende Unglück bis in Einzelheiten voraussagt."

ment (12:35-46), clearly the community is not addressed here, for the paradigms invoke the quintessential “outsiders”—Noah’s generation and the people of Sodom—and thus are hardly paedagogically effective analogies of the elect community. Likewise, comparison with a “corpse” is not apt as a description for insiders. Finally, the judgments associated with Noah’s generation and Sodom were visited on entire societies. Correspondingly, the mention of Noah entering the ark and of Lot leaving Sodom hold out to the intended audience the prospect of salvation from impending judgment. In effect 17:23-37 is protreptic: the Q group seeks adherents by promoting itself to its contemporaries as the elect end time community.

Results

(1) Q’s sayings clusters are exemplars of the instructional speech genre. These include: Love Your Enemies (6:27-36), Judge Not (6:37-42), Trees, Fruit, and Speech (6:43-45), Confident Prayer (11:2-13), Beelzebul Controversy (11:14-23), Request for a Sign (11:29-35), Courageous Witness (12:2-12), Do Not Be Anxious (12:22-31, 33-34), Be Watchful and Ready (12:35-46), Discerning the Times (12:49-59), Enter Through the Narrow Door (13:24-30; 14:11, 16-24, 26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35), and Discerning the Day of the Son of Man (17:23-37), for a total of twelve speeches. Each displays the following defining features of the instructional speech genre: (a) *programmatic opening*, expressed either as an admonition, a maxim, or both, frequently followed by a *motive or rationale* clause; (b) a *course of argumentation* which motivates response to the programmatic theme, using an assortment of forms such as parables, rhetorical questions, paradigms, exempla, promise clauses, admonitions, threats of divine sanction, and supportive gnomes, maxims, and aphorisms.

(2) Q speeches share among themselves common *stylistic* features, that is, features applied at the discretion of the composer. The programmatic opening frequently is brought to a climactic, *specific application* in the final unit; correspondingly, several evince *movement from the general and metaphorical to the specific and concrete*. Most of Q’s instructional speeches invoke closure with a final admonition, maxim, or both, which establish an *inclusio* or *frame-*

work connection with the programmatic opening. Several display the *gnomic center* compositional convention (with the exception of 6:43-45; 12:2-12; 12:33-34; 17:23-37): a gnome (or gnomes) or other succinct, aphoristic pronouncement is placed near the middle of each of the Q speeches, where, expressed either indicatively or as an imperative, it encapsulates the main deliberative concern of the speech. Some have a christological focal point (6:40; 11:20; 11:33; 12:40). In each case, this central saying is *flanked by illustrative units*, expressed variously as parables, analogies, metaphorical gnomes, or paradigms, not infrequently in the form of *rhetorical questions*, which concretize with vivid images and situations the programmatic wisdom expressed at the threshold of the speech. In two of the twelve cases single-attestation passages (11:5-8; 12:35-38) appear to be integral parts of their respective speeches. However, even if one takes a doctrinaire position on excluding these units, the speeches in question are still easily classified as exemplars of the genre, bearing resemblance to the configuration displayed by 6:43-45.

In view of the repeated application of these stylistic traits, it is likely that all twelve speeches were arranged and textualized by the same hand or hands. No warrants exist for supposing that a single one formed gradually and incrementally or is a sedimentized witness to some multi-layered archaeology of early Christianity. Nevertheless, a *diachrony* can certainly be posited—the editor obviously had access to a body of traditions of indeterminate status. There is no recoverable evidence of these being in the form of a literary *Vorlage*, though some may have existed in the form of “dominical discourses” such as are posited by Sellew.⁴³⁷ In other words, the Q redaction evident in the formation of these twelve speeches constitutes an original act of textualization utilizing (in a somewhat rote manner, particularly when compared with the varied compositional repertoire displayed by Sirach) quite conventional genre patterns and anything but innovative stylistic devices.

(3) Q's sayings clusters belong in the same literary category as other Hellenistic-Jewish paraenetic compositions such as those found in *Sirach* and *Pseudo-Phocylides*.

⁴³⁷ Philip Sellew, “Early Collections of Jesus' Words: The Development of Dominical Discourses,” (Th.D. Diss., Harvard University, 1985).

(4) In the same vein, the *Kleinliteratur* model for the formation of Q, predicated upon classical form-criticism's view of the formation of the synoptic tradition, should be rejected. Its manifest uselessness for Q analysis raises questions about its utility as a model for reconstructing the formation of the synoptic traditions in general. Also in need of reexamination are the social histories of early Christianity ancillary to it.

(5) Each of the twelve speeches, though a composite made up of diverse tradition-history units, exhibits cohesion and hence coherence. Each enacts with precision a focused rhetorical strategy, related to a certain sapiential topos, within a specific social situation. None displays any sign of having been interpolated or subjected to secondary redaction prior to Matthean and Lukan appropriation. The question of whether the twelve have been integrated as an encompassing set of serialized units (that is, as a kind of sapiential *Vorlage*) into a second redaction will be treated in the final chapter.

(6) Prophetic elements, that is, threats of judgment, in Q's instructional speeches are subordinated to the instructional framework genre, which employs them as part of its motivational apparatus. Most are rendered in a sapiential idiom.

(7) Chreias, when they appear, are likewise integrated into the instructional speech format, supplying the programmatic opening for the Beelzebul Controversy and the Request for a Sign. In neither case is there sign of a genre clash. In view of this we should be less inclined to interpret the appearance of chreias in Q diachronically as evidence of a genre shift towards a chreia collection, a genre which does not tend to form longer speeches. Rather, the instructional speech genre employed by Q has appropriated this Greco-Roman form. This is not surprising in view of the cross-cultural exchanges, appropriations, and adaptations which were characteristic of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, not to speak of the fact that from the theoretical perspective, mixing genres in literature often seems the rule rather than the exception.

(8) Speeches addressed to outsiders, whether hostile or uncommitted (11:14-23; 11:29-35; 12:49-59; 13:24-14:35; 17:23-37), are not distinguishable in form from those addressed directly to the group (11:2-13; 12:2-12; 12:22-31, 33-34; 12:35-46). The speeches of the Sermon (6:27-35; 6:37-42; 6:43-45) should not, just because

they lack strong threats, automatically be classified as narrowly community directed; rather, the Sermon appears to be protreptic, featuring as it does the invitation of the sage to acquire wisdom (6:40). In any case, it is doubtful that change in audience can function without further ado as an overriding redaction-history indicator. Because of the family resemblance among Q's instructional speeches, it is likely that the Sermon (6:20b-49) came into existence as a result of the editorial initiative that produced the other wisdom speeches.⁴³⁸

(9) Q's instructional speeches treat wisdom topoi: friendship, reciprocity, treatment of enemies, gaining wisdom, proper speech, prayer, courage, self-provision, servants and masters, household affairs, status relations, family relations, discerning the times and seasons, banqueting and hospitality. However, Q's treatment of these topoi is idiosyncratic, or better, *aphoristic*. This may be due to the fact that in Q imminent judgment threatens and hence invalidates the normative order of things.

(10) The practice of serializing instructional speeches devoted to diverse topoi is a genre feature of the Egyptian Instructions and is found also in Hellenistic-Jewish paraenetic texts such as *Sirach*, *Syriac Menander*, *Pseudo-Phocylides*, and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

(11) The Love Enemies instruction stands at the threshold of—or as frontispiece to—Q's serialization of speeches, where it sounds the programmatic note of Q's paraenetic project. Moreover, it treats in an explicit manner the reciprocity ethic, the fundamental social dynamic which in its various nuances animates other areas of social interaction.⁴³⁹ This indicates that some thought has gone into the manner in which these self-contained instructional speeches are arranged relative to one another and hence raises the issue of *macro composition*.

Though these twelve speeches together constitute a great deal

⁴³⁸ Corroborating Leif Vaage's theory; see "Composite Texts and Oral Mythology: The Case of the 'Sermon' in Q (6:20-49)," in *Conflict and Invention*, 75-97, esp. 80-92; idem, "Son of Man Sayings," 108.

⁴³⁹ On the fundamental nature of the reciprocity ethic see Thomas W. Galant, *Risk & Survival in Ancient Greece. Reconstructing the Rural Domestic Economy* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 143-44. The instructional portion of Hesiod's *Works and Days* likewise opens with a discussion of reciprocity obligations (lines 335-54).

of Q's text, significant portions of Q do not conform to the instructional speech genre. We shall analyze these in the next chapter as part of our search for the existence of larger compositions which may incorporate the smaller units into more encompassing arrangements or, alternatively, point to subsequent and secondary redactional activity.⁴⁴⁰

⁴⁴⁰ See van Leeuwen, *Context and Meaning*, 31.

CHAPTER FOUR

MACRO COMPOSITION IN WISDOM LITERATURE AND IN Q

Serialization of instructional clusters treating diverse topics is itself a conventional macro arrangement, though one that does not yet account for the remaining Q materials. Our approach in this chapter will be similar to that taken in the analysis of the smaller speeches: testing for the presence or lack of editorial devices organizing and creating cohesion across sections of text, in this case, extended sections made up of two or more sayings clusters. Macro arrangements if present will manifest themselves as genre-specific text configurations in combination with stylistic conventions utilizing such devices as catchword, key word, motif, and form-critical recurrence. Macro-compositional proposals must be founded upon the form-critical and linguistic characteristics of the constituent units of the text, as well as upon the manner of their division, juxtaposition, and interconnection.

As noted, we have already encountered intriguing indicators of editorial attempts to create meaningful and at the same time conventional macro sequences in Q; the serialization of instructional speeches treating diverse topoi and, with respect to this serialization, the frontispiece positioning of an instruction explicitly focused upon reciprocity (Love Your Enemies), the general ethic which regulates specific spheres of social interaction. Overt or residual *Kleinliteratur* prejudices have predisposed many scholars against the notion that Q might be the product of a *thoroughgoing* redactional initiative guided down to small details by application of genre, topoi, stylistic, and rhetorical conventions of ancient wisdom texts. Nevertheless, a number of Q scholars, beginning in the recent phase of research with Lührmann, not infrequently (and sometimes in contradiction to professed views of Q's formation) make astute macro compositional observations with regard to editorial techniques at work in this or that extended passage in Q. Our task is to evaluate, synthesize, and supplement these in accordance with consistent application of the

methodology we have articulated for that purpose, a major aspect of which is demonstration of the *rhetorical, communicative, text-pragmatic function* exercised by posited macro sequences.

First we shall survey the progress of recent scholarship in reconstructing macro-compositional techniques in ancient instructional genres to see if such provide models applicable in a heuristic manner to Q.

Macro-compositional Techniques in Ancient Wisdom Literature

Egyptian Instructions

Most Egyptian Instructions are concatenations of composite instructional speeches, though showing sufficient variety in this internal arrangement to render other generalizations difficult. *Amenemope* displays a high level of internal organization, consisting of thirty numbered chapters and revolving around “two basic themes: first, the depiction of the ideal man, the ‘silent man,’ and his adversary, the ‘heated man’; second, the exhortation to honesty and warnings against dishonesty.”¹ In other texts speeches are juxtaposed haphazardly to form an encompassing instructional body treating a multiplicity of topoi, with catchword association frequently the means of facilitating movement from one instructional cluster to the next. Some Instructions have subdivisions devoted to a particular theme (*Merikare, Khety, son of Duauf, Lemuel*), while others have subdivisions of instructions devoted to a variety of topics (*Any*). Finally, Egyptian Instructions frequently appropriate a variety of non-instructional genres, such as hymns, prayers, autobiography, laudative biography, burial ritual, juristic and medical speech.²

Most Egyptian Instructions supply a title identifying an authoritative author and the document itself as an Instruction, and many frame the instructional-speech body with a prologue and epilogue. The title and prologue invoke the father/son paed-

¹ Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature* 2.147; note the alternation of positive exhortation with warning.

² Kitchen, “Basic Literary Forms,” 250; Hellmut Brunner, *Altägyptische Weisheit. Lehren für das Leben* (Zürich, München: Artemis, 1988), 76-78, 81; de Buck, “Composition,” 184-85, 193-97.

gological situation. The prologue frequently includes an appellative call to heed (*Aufmerksamkeitsruf*), sometimes repeated in the epilogue, which might incorporate a hymn to the creator (*Merikare*), a prayer (*Insinger*), admonition to continual prayer (*Ankhsheshonq*), a promise of reward for attending to the instructions (*Kagemni*), or an outlook upon the future office of the instructee (*Amtsübergabe*; for example, *Amenemhat I*, addressed to the future king Sesostri I). In quite a few cases the epilogue picks up motifs sounded in the prologue and thus forms an *inclusio*. As a rule calls to heed in Egyptian Instructions are restricted to the framework and do not recur within the body of the serialized speeches.³

Sirach

Sirach scholars have noted elements of macro structuration visible in the placement of speeches in praise of Wisdom at the beginning (chapter 1), middle (chapter 24), and end (chapter 51) and suggest some topical organization within this overarching arrangement.⁴ Some scholars have posited a second level of structure. Taking up suggestions made by Roth, Harvey argues that each of the two major divisions of Sirach is subdivided into four sections. The first seven of these sections are severally introduced by a wisdom poem that sets forth programmatically ("previews") the theme to be treated by individual units in the following section. For example, the programmatic wisdom poem (4:11-19) of the second section (4:11-6:17) describes Wisdom "as one who tests those who claim to love her before revealing her secrets to them." The two instructional sections which follow (4:20-6:4; 6:5-17) "address personal considerations for those who claim to love wisdom....6:5-17 discusses the importance of choosing friends carefully....This teaching echoes the care wisdom exercises in choosing her companions as described in 4:11-19."⁵ Thus Sirach begins

³ Römheld, *Formgeschichte*, 23, 25, 33-34, 38-41, 79; Brunner, *Altägyptische Weisheit*, 78-79; de Buck, "Composition," 190-91; Kitchen, "Basic Literary Forms," 247.

⁴ For example, Georg Sauer, *Jesus Sirach (Ben Sira)*, JSHRZ Band III (Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1981), 494; Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 74; John D. Harvey, "Toward a Degree of Order in Ben Sira's Book," *ZAW* 105 (1993) 52-62, esp. 52; Roth, "Gnomic-Discursive Wisdom," 74.

⁵ Harvey, "Degree of Order," 55; see also 53-54, 61; see also Roth, "Gnomic-Discursive Wisdom," 74, and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 17, 137, 190, 262.

by introducing the protagonist, Wisdom, in her relationship to God and her status as a gift from God (1:1-30), and then proceeds with instructional "chapters" similarly introduced by programmatic Wisdom poems.

W. Baumgartner demonstrates Sirach's genre heterogeneity. Chapter 51:1-12 contains a hymn of thanks to God, a genre which springs from "der jubelnden Begeisterung über Gottes Macht und Größe." In this case the hymn gives thanks for deliverance from the slanders of opponents.⁶ In another case, a hymnic thanksgiving for punishing the arrogant (10:14-18) concludes an instructional concatenation directed against the vice of arrogance (10:6-13).⁷ A prayer for deliverance from a loose tongue appears in 22:27-23:6, a prayer which may have been at home originally in the lament genre, but which here introduces a conventional instruction on guarding one's lips.⁸ Woes, a form appropriate to "prophetischen Schelt- und Drohreden," appear in 2:12-14 and 41:8-9 where they are "in die Lehrdichtung übernommen."⁹ Sirach at times assumes the mantle of the prophet. In 47:22 he delivers a prophecy of the future which he appears to have composed himself, though using conventional expressions.¹⁰ In 24:33 and 39:6 Sirach speaks of the sage as filled with the Spirit in a manner similar to the prophet.

Baumgartner suggests that instructional speeches incorporate foreign genres in order to effect "eine Erweiterung des Gedankenkreises"; moreover, "sorgen sie für eine wohltuende Abwechslung, eine Unterbrechung der mehr einförmigen lehrhaften Rede-weise."¹¹ The instructional speech framework genre appropriates the vivid and stirring pathological effects of these non-wisdom genres to serve the instructional goal.¹²

⁶ Baumgartner, "Gattungen," 178; see also Thomas, *Phokylides*, 245.

⁷ Baumgartner, "Gattungen," 194.

⁸ Baumgartner, "Gattungen," 185-86.

⁹ Baumgartner, "Gattungen," 188.

¹⁰ Baumgartner, "Gattungen," 188-89.

¹¹ Baumgartner, "Gattungen," 194. This is reminiscent of Aristotle's advice.

¹² Baumgartner, "Gattungen," 186. Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paränese*, WUNT 2/28 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1987), 103, notes the same genre diversity in the *Test. 12 Pat.*: "Die TestXII zeigen immer wieder einen sehr freien Umgang mit Erzähltraditionen, paränetischen Stücken zu verschiedenen Themen sowie prophetischen Zukunftsansagen....Variabilität gehört geradezu zu den Gattungsmerkmalen des Testaments."

Pseudo-Phocylides

Wilson analyzes the macro arrangement which organizes the smaller instructional speeches in *Ps.-Phoc.* After a prologue (1-2) and a brief summary rendition of the Decalogue (3-8), *Ps.-Phoc.* divides into two sections. The first section (lines 9-131) falls into four parts reflecting the ancient Canon of the Four Cardinal Virtues: Justice (9-54), Moderation (55-96), Courage (fortitude) (97-121), Wisdom (and speech) (122-31). The second section (132-227) is an "exhortation structured according to the different relationships in which one lives," or "spheres of social life": relationships with social outsiders (132-52); the nature and importance of work (153-74); personal responsibilities within the household (175-227). The macro arrangement of this section engineers a movement from those most socially removed (outsiders), to one's social relationships vis à vis one's vocation, culminating in a discussion about proper relations with one's social intimates (household).¹³ These subdivisions contain at least one and frequently two or more smaller instructional compositions themselves carefully arranged with respect to one another. For example, in lines 175-227 Pseudo-Phocylides applies the *Haustafel* scheme, "dealing successively with obligations concerning marriage, children, and slaves...."¹⁴

Between the prologue (lines 1-2) and the first large section (9-131) is placed a short section which Wilson and van der Horst describe as a sapientialized and hence freely-worded summary of the Decalogue (lines 3-8):¹⁵

Do not commit adultery nor rouse male passion.
Do not contrive deceptions nor defile your hands with blood.
Be not unjustly rich but live from lawful means.

¹³ Wilson, *Mysteries*, 63, 119.

¹⁴ Wilson, *Mysteries*, 134; see also p. 141. Derron, *Sentences*, xxvi-xxvii, divides the text into fifteen topical sections conventional in Greek gnomologia, for example, *περὶ πλούτου* (42-47), *περὶ φρονήσεως* (48-50), *περὶ φθόνου* (70-75), *περὶ σωφρονύσης* (76-96), *περὶ θανάτου καὶ ψυχῆς* (97-115), *περὶ τύχης* (116-21), *περὶ λόγου καὶ σοφίας* (122-31), *περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας* (132-52), *περὶ ἐργασίας* (153-74), *περὶ γάμου* (175-206), *περὶ παιδων καὶ γονέων* (207-22), *περὶ δεσποτῶν καὶ οἰκετῶν* (223-27). This division seems reconcilable on most points with Wilson's.

¹⁵ Wilson, *Mysteries*, 64-70; van der Horst, *Sentences*, 112.

Be satisfied with what is at hand and refrain from what belongs to others.

Speak not falsehoods but always say things that are true.

First of all honor God and thereafter your parents.

Wilson argues that the formulation of this unit is influenced by the ancient Canon of Two Virtues (εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη, or ὁσιότης and φιλανθρωπία): vertical obligations to one's superiors (gods, parents; also the dead) and horizontal reciprocity obligations to one's peers (friends, neighbors).¹⁶ The Canon of Two Virtues was customarily located in an inaugural position at or near the beginning of the wisdom texts which adduced it (*Golden Verses* 1-7, *Dicta Catonis* 1-5, *Ad Dem.* 13-16, *Syr. Men.* 10-14, 20-26).¹⁷

Lines 1-2 and 228-230 constitute the prologue and epilogue and form an inclusio by virtue of the repetition of ταῦτα δίκησ' ὁσίησι θεοῦ βουλεύματα (line 1) as ταῦτα δικαιοσύνης μυστήρια (line 229), by which the "resolutions of God, through judgments divine" are interpreted as being the "mysteries of righteousness," and vice versa. Both the prologue and epilogue promise a blessing upon the reader, be it the "blessed gifts" (2), referring to the precepts which follow, or the promise of a "good life until the threshold of old age" which concludes the collection.¹⁸ These framework units endow the gnomologium with the status of revelation and construct Pseudo-Phocylides as a revealer-figure, for the first line invokes God as the source of the wisdom, the second line states that "Phocylides, wisest of men, reveals (φαίνει) [them] as blessed gifts," and lines 229-30 characterize the wisdom as mysteries, initiation into which—with the poet as mystagogue—blesses one with "a good life." Pseudo-Phocylides' self-description, "wisest of men"—a Solomonic epithet—establishes his credentials before the actual instruction is inaugurated in line 3

¹⁶ Wilson, *Mysteries of Righteousness*, 70; see also Wefelmeier, *Sentenzensammlung*, 79. The epitome of the Law in Josephus, *Ap.* 2, 190-219, likewise deals first with God (190b-198), then family (199-204), various topics including civic relationships (205), and concludes conventionally with a curse and blessing (215-218). See Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 216-17.

¹⁷ For a fuller enumeration of Greco-Roman texts which adduce these two cardinal virtues, see Wefelmeier, *Sentenzensammlung*, 79, notes 2, 4, 5, and page 80, notes 2-4.

¹⁸ Wilson, *Mysteries*, 64, 150-51; see also Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 264, and Thomas, *Phokylides*, 6.

by the Decalogue summary.¹⁹ Adducing the Decalogue in lines 3-8 brings the sage into authorizing proximity to the Torah. Thus the first eight lines of the text are a strenuous exercise in legitimation and authorization.

Golden Verses

In chapter two we noted how the juxtaposition of some of the *Golden Verses*' individual instructions created longer yet cohesive elaborations. Macro composition is evident already at the beginning of the *Golden Verses* (1-8), which opens in a conventional manner by invoking the descending hierarchy of honor and obligation that begins with the gods, moves to lesser divinities, parents, relatives, and terminates in the horizontal relationship of friendship:²⁰

Honor the immortal gods first, in the order appointed by custom,
and revere your oath. Pay reverence next to the noble heroes
and the spirits of the dead by performing the prescribed rites.
Honor your parents as well as their closest relatives.
Among others, choose as your friend him who excels in virtue.
Yield to his gentle words and useful actions,
and do not hate your friend for a small fault.

This conventional beginning initiates a macro-compositional arrangement encompassing the entire text. Both Thom and Küchler suggest that the *Verses* falls into two main divisions. Lines 1-49 present moral precepts for living a virtuous life and thus are characterized by imperatives. Lines 50-71 set forth future-indicatively the promises and benefits which are the reward of the purified life so described, specifically, insight into mysteries and assurance of future deification.²¹ Thom states, "The whole poem therefore exhibits a conditional structure on the macro level: 'If you do what I command you in the first part, *then* you will have the benefits promised in the second part'."²²

¹⁹ Wilson, *Mysteries*, 150, 167-70, 199. A similar association, though with Wisdom as Revelatrice and Ben Sira as her instrument, is attested in *Sir* 24:1-33.

²⁰ Thom, *Commentary*, 64-65, 104-25; see above on *Ps.-Phoc.*

²¹ Thom, *Commentary*, 64, 73-74; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 271-72.

²² Thom, *Commentary*, 64; see also van der Horst, *Vers d'Or*, 30.

The first section (lines 1-49) is itself divided into two subsections. The opening section describes, as noted, the hierarchy of relationships to be cultivated with proper piety (lines 1-8). The second section (lines 9-49) "contains precepts about the virtues to be mastered and practiced in order to advance towards spiritual maturity."²³ Lines 9b-20 are organized according to the four cardinal virtues: moderation (9b-12), justice (13), moral insight (14-16, *φρόνησις*), and courage (17-20). Lines 21-26 then describe persuasive discourse, lines 26-39 advise deliberation and moderation, lines 40-44 moral retrospection, and lines 45-49 conclude the first section with an exhortation to master these virtues.²⁴ As was seen in Thom's analysis of lines 1-4 and 27-39, both the small instructional units and the more encompassing subdivisions are demarcated by such devices as *inclusio* and *chiasm*. The long section on the virtues (lines 9b-49) is itself marked out by an *inclusio*: *κρατεῖν δ' εἰθίζεο τῶνδε* (9b); *τούτων δὲ κρατήσας* (49b).²⁵ Line 49b is a pivot statement which transits to the promissory half of the text: "When you have mastered these things, you will come to know...."²⁶ Thom points out that line 9b likewise correlates the opening lines with the long section on the virtues: "Know the above, then, and accustom yourself to be master of the following...." Thus the various large subsections of the *Golden Verses* are linked by coordinating sentences which adopt a retrospective and prospective stance.

As noted, the second section (50-71) consists largely of a series of promises about the acquisition of esoteric insight and concludes with assurance of immortal, divine status to be attained as a final reward for following the discipline of the sect. It also contains a description of the "wretched people" outside the sect "who do not see (*ἑσορῶσιν*) the good even though it is near, nor do they hear (*κλύουσι*) it" (54-55), as well as a prayer to *Ζεῦ πάτερ* for the moral and esoteric insight which saves from such a fate (61-62).²⁷ As was the case with the first section, *inclusio* and *chiasm* weave lines 50-71 together.²⁸

²³ Thom, *Commentary*, 64-65.

²⁴ Thom, *Commentary*, 64-65.

²⁵ Thom, *Commentary*, 125; van der Horst, *Vers d'Or*, 32.

²⁶ See van der Horst, *Vers d'Or*, 25-26.

²⁷ Thom, *Commentary*, 65-66.

²⁸ Thom, *Commentary*, 178, 212.

An encompassing arrangement binds the two halves of the text into an integrated unity, consisting in repetition of the term “immortal god(s)” at the beginning, middle, and end of the poem: ἄθανάτους θεούς (1); ἀθανάτων θεῶν (50); ἀθάνατος θεὸς ἄμβροτος (71). More significantly, these repetitions trace the moral and spiritual ascent of the adept. Line 1 urges pious worship of the immortal gods as the first in a series of moral exercises. Line 50 then promises knowledge of the “essence of immortal gods” once the preceding regimen of precepts has been mastered. Line 71 surpasses even this by promising the final apotheosis of the adept following upon these moral and mystical attainments: he (or she) will become an “immortal god.”²⁹ Thus, at the end of each section, the text promises some *elevation of status*; in fact, the text revolves around such status-changes.

The semi-divine revealer figure, Pythagoras, the chain of tradition entrusted to him, and the community founded by him, are given emphatic profile at the pivotal center of the text:

This will put you in the footsteps of divine Virtue,
yes, by him who imparted (τὸν παραδόντα) to our soul the *tetraktys*,
fount of ever-flowing nature (46-48).

This serves to connect the wisdom of the poem via a semi-divine intermediary to the divine sphere and thereby to equate it with divine revelation.³⁰ This feature, taken together with the poem’s prescription of a specific way of life and its promise to alleviate the sufferings of fate and facilitate final immortality, shows that the *Golden Verses* is a *hieros logos*, a charter document normative for the religious and moral life of a community, promising transcendence to those who adhere to its precepts.³¹

²⁹ Thom, *Commentary*, 92, 177, 188, 212-13, 229.

³⁰ Thom, *Commentary*, 65. 173-74. Thom states, “The *tetraktys*, meaning something like ‘the unit of four,’ is a complex symbol for the Pythagorean insight into the mysteries of nature” (65). See also van der Horst, *Vers d’Or*, 28-30, and Wilson, *Mysteries*, 189.

³¹ Thom, *Commentary*, 68, 75-76.

Wisdom of Solomon

The *Wisdom of Solomon* supplies a rich fund of information on ancient compositional techniques.³² We shall examine three compositions: the critique of idolatry in chapters 13-15, the prayer of Solomon in chapter 9—for both of these following the analyses of Gilbert—and the conflict between the righteous and the wicked in chapters 1-6, following Kolarcik and Schmitt.

By detecting structuring devices such as inclusio and other forms of key word and motif recurrence, Gilbert works out the following macro-structure for *Wis* 13:10-15:13, a passage which critiques idolatry:

- A. Idols of gold, silver, stone, and wood; the role of the wood-cutter (13:10-19)
 - B. Invocation of God, reference to the history of salvation (Red Sea passage, Noah) (14:1-10)
 - C. Punishment of the idols (14:11)
 - Invention and consequences of idolatry (14:12-29)
 - Punishment of idolaters (14:30-31)
 - B' Invocation of God, reference to the history of salvation (Covenant) (15:1-6).
- A' Idols of clay, role of the potter (15:7-13)³³

Some special features of the middle section (14:11-31) command our attention. Gilbert notes the solemn tone, derived from the reference to the name of God, which characterizes 14:21, a pronouncement positioned between two large sections that discuss respectively the invention of idolatry (vv. 12-20) and the immorality which is its consequence (vv. 22-29): "And this became a hidden trap for humankind, because people, in bondage to misfortune or to royal authority, bestowed on objects of stone or wood the name that ought not to be shared."³⁴ This verse occupies the center of the entire composition, which may not be unrelated to the fact that it articulates the *main thesis*: idolatry amounts to giving the name of the true God to material objects; idolatry is a trap for humanity. The verse also has a coordinating function, for the "bondage to misfortune or to royal authority"

³² Kolarcik, *Ambiguity of Death*, x.

³³ Maurice Gilbert, *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse (Sg 13-15)*, AnBib 53 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973), 253-54.

³⁴ Gilbert, *Le critique*, 131. I cite from the NRSV.

refers back to the case made in 14:12-20 that idolatry arose when people fashioned images (1) of suddenly deceased children and (2) of monarchs. The "hidden trap" anticipates the description of moral degradation which results from idol veneration (14:22-29; see 14:11b-12). "Bestowing on objects of stone or wood the name" refers as well to the framework units which describe the woodcutter and potter doing just that (see 13:10: "those who give the name 'gods' to the works of human hands"). Hence 14:21 epitomizes the deliberative concern of the macro composition and binds it together, making reference as it does to the units which immediately flank it as well as to the more distant framework units.

Gilbert's study of the composition of Solomon's prayer for wisdom in *Wis* 9 brings to light another case of a centrally-positioned unit recapitulating motifs of framework units. The following is a slightly adapted representation of Gilbert's analysis:

- A. God creates the world and humanity through Wisdom (9:1-3)
- B. "Give me the Wisdom that sits by your throne" (9:4)
- C. Frailty of human understanding without Wisdom (9:5-6)
- D. Solomon's tasks:
 - a. rule
 - b. judge
 - c. build the temple (9:7-8)
- E. Wisdom has all knowledge and understanding (9:9)
- F. "Send her forth from the holy heavens, and from the throne of your glory send her...that I may learn what is pleasing to you" (9:10)
- E' Wisdom knows and understands all things (9:11)
- D' Solomon's
 - c' works will be acceptable
 - b' he will judge justly
 - a' he will be worthy of David's throne (9:12)
- C' Frailty of human understanding (9:13-16)
- B' "Who has learned your counsel, unless you have given wisdom and sent your holy spirit from on high?" (9:17)
- A' Humanity saved through Wisdom (9:18)³⁵

The units AB and B'A' together form the framework of the com-

³⁵ Maurice Gilbert, "La structure de la prière de Salomon (Sg 9)," *Bib* 51 (1970) 301-31, esp. 315.

position, with the A-A' units situating Solomon's request for wisdom within the cosmic context of God's acts of *creation* and *salvation*, with Wisdom as agent in both. The intervening units justify the request for Wisdom, which for its part is repeated in full at the center.³⁶ Again we see the central unit of a composition articulating the central concern of that composition and binding the composition into a unity by establishing motif and key word connections with the framework units. The motif of Wisdom as Salvatrice sounded in the concluding framework unit (9:18) then becomes the leading topic resounding throughout the following section (*Wis* 10:1-12:2), thereby binding these two macro-instructional units together. Q will employ the same technique to link its large discourses.

We conclude with an analysis of the macro-structure of *Wis* 1:1-6:21 in which we shall depend largely upon recent studies by Kolarcik and Schmitt.³⁷

The first unit (1:1-15) addresses those who "judge the earth" (οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν), instructing them to "love justice" and setting up a contrast between justice and injustice (or righteousness and unrighteousness), indicated by a demarcating inclusio formed by δικαιοσύνη (1:1, 15). This large unit itself consists of three smaller units each marked out by inclusios: verses 1-5, 6-11, and 12-15.³⁸ Moreover, to link these subunits the author uses "hook words"—a word or motif which closes one unit is taken up at or near the beginning of the next. For example, πνεῦμα, σοφία (1:4, 5) are both repeated in the first verse of the second subunit (1:6); similarly ἀναιρεῖ, ὅλεθρον occur in verse 11, closing the middle unit, and in verse 12, opening the final unit.³⁹

³⁶ Gilbert, "La structure," 326.

³⁷ Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, published in 1991, and Armin Schmitt, "Zur dramatischen Form von Weisheit 1,1-6,21," *BZ* 37 (1993) 236-58. Earlier studies of the composition of 1:1-6:21 are by James M. Reese, "Plan and Structure in the Book of Wisdom," *CBQ* 27 (1965) 391-99, and Addison G. Wright, "The Structure of the Book of Wisdom," *Bib* 48 (1967) 165-84. Since both Kolarcik's and Schmitt's studies appropriate the work of Reese and Wright and utilize some unpublished German and Italian dissertations, we shall follow their analyses.

³⁸ Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 34-36.

³⁹ Wright, "Structure," 170, note 3, who aptly calls these words "*mots crochets*." Gilbert, *La critique*, 254-55, calls attention to the same technique in *Wis* 13-15, and Thomas, *Phokylides*, 133, in *Ps.-Phoc*. These are cases of the common and ancient technique of linking units by *association*.

The next large unit is 1:16-2:24, which describes the base reasoning of the wicked, and the *mot crochet* here is "death" (compare 1:16 with 1:12, 15). The wicked reason that since death is inevitable and nothing exists beyond this life, they are justified in living hedonistically in the present and oppressing, even murdering "the righteous poor man" because of the latter's reproach of their lifestyle. The arrogant monologue of the wicked (2:1b-20) is framed by two editorial comments (1:16-2:1a; 2:21-24), both of which link this sort of evil reasoning with death.⁴⁰ The speech of the wicked is in turn divided into three smaller sections: (a) 2:1b-5 sets forth the wicked's godless, materialistic view of life, (b) 2:6-11 describes how the wicked "make use" of enjoyable things and use their might to exploit the weak, and in (c) 2:12-20 the wicked plot the murder of the righteous who oppose them and who claim God as father.⁴¹

The next large section, 3:1-4:20 (the central unit) is made up of four diptychs which set forth a "series of contrasts the author establishes between the just and the wicked."⁴² The first diptych (3:1-12) contrasts the hope of the righteous with the vain hope of the wicked (3:4b, 11b). The next subunit (3:13-4:6) consists of two parallel diptychs which treat the problem of the apparent fruitfulness of the wicked and sterility of the righteous. "Through the contrasts, the author declares the reverse to be the case in each example."⁴³ The fourth diptych (4:7-20) contrasts the elect state of the righteous with the fate of the wicked. The pivot around which the contrast turns is 4:16, "The righteous who have died will condemn the ungodly who are living..." and depicts a *reversal of status* in which the righteous will judge the wicked, their former oppressors, in the day of God's judgment.⁴⁴ The motif of status-reversal in which the suffering righteous are exalted and the wicked punished, a reversal manifested in the

⁴⁰ Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 39, shows that this framework-main body relationship is signalled verbally:

a τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος εἶναι (1:16d)
 b λογισάμενοι οὐκ ὀρθῶς (2:1a)
 b' ταῦτα ἐλογίσαντο (2:21a)
 a' τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ὄντες (2:24b).

⁴¹ Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 39-41.

⁴² Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 41.

⁴³ Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 42.

⁴⁴ See Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 43-44.

day of judgment, governs all four diptychs of this central section.

The fourth large unit (5:1-23) is a speech of the wicked and thus forms a counterpart to the second unit, and like the latter is framed by editorial comments reflecting on the horrible fate of the wicked (5:1-3, 14-23).⁴⁵ However, the tone of the speech has altered radically from that in chapter 2, now expressing regret and fear instead of arrogance. Like the speech in chapter 2, this speech can be broken down into three parts: in (a) 5:4-5 the wicked contemplate with regret the righteous whom they oppressed, in (b) 5:6-8 the wicked recognize the error of their lifestyle, and in (c) 5:9-13 the wicked recognize “the transience and fragility of their accumulated riches” and of their life in general.⁴⁶ This three-fold thematic division precisely parallels the three-fold division of the speech in chapter 2, but in reverse order. This reverse parallelism elaborates a cruel irony seen in the correspondence of 2:1b-8, where the transience of human life became the pre-text for the wicked to live hedonistically, with 5:9-13, where the wicked now deeply regret a life so transient in its wickedness that it gave birth to no virtue.⁴⁷

The final large section is 6:1-21, marked out by the inclusio βασιλεῖς, βασιλεύσητε (6:1, 21).⁴⁸ These are the same group—“O judges of the ends of the earth” (6:1) (δικασταὶ περάτων γῆς)—addressed in the first section—“You rulers of the earth” (1:1: οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν). Like the opening section, 6:1-21 is an instruction, liberally salted with threats of divine sanction, to seek wisdom, in elaborative contrast to the first section, which exhorts to seek righteousness. Also like 1:1-15, 6:1-21 draws a portrait of Wisdom.

The lexical and semantic affinities between the opening and closing units of this first large section as well as similar correspondences between the second and fourth units reveal a concentric arrangement which can be presented as follows:

- A. Rulers of the Earth to Seek Justice (1:1-15)
- B. Arrogant Speech of the Wicked (1:16-2:24)

⁴⁵ Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 45-46; see also Schmitt, “Form,” 237.

⁴⁶ Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 45-46.

⁴⁷ Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 46.

⁴⁸ Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 48.

- a. transience of life (2:1-5)
- b. hedonistic enjoyment of life (2:6-11)
- c. oppression and murder of the righteous (2:12-20)
- C. Reversal of Status of Righteous and Wicked in Judgment (3:1-4:20)
- B' Regretful Speech of the Wicked (5:1-23)
 - c' perception of the high status of the righteous (5:4-5)
 - b' acknowledgment of the futility of an indulgent lifestyle (5:6-8)
 - a' regret for a transient life unredeemed by virtue (5:9-13)

A' Rulers of the Earth to Seek Wisdom (6:1-21)

Above we noted the lexical and semantic connections between the framework instructional units, 1:1-15 and 6:1-21.⁴⁹ Schmitt points out that both A and A' make use of forensic terminology, "die die Verantwortlichkeit des Menschen vor einem kommenden Gericht einschärft."⁵⁰ Both opening and closing units depict a court setting in which God takes account of the deeds of the rulers of the earth. As noted, however, these units are instructions which urge the rulers to seek justice and wisdom, and the threat of divine judgment functions as motivation.

The B and B' units (1:16-2:24) are structurally and thematically coordinated: each profiles a tripartite speech of the wicked framed by the evaluative comments of the sage. Between the speeches, comments, and their constituent parts exist precise semantic and lexical connections.⁵¹ Most striking, however, is the reversal in mood and attitude which takes place between B and B'. In 1:16-2:24 the wicked are arrogant, powerful, sleek, and overweening, whereas in 5:1-23 they are humbled, weak, and full of regret at the sudden but tardy perception of the error of their ways. Similarly the righteous have shifted from being easy targets for oppression and exploitation to being seen as "children of God" (5:5).⁵² Schmitt states:

⁴⁹ See Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 53-54, for a detailed list of the lexical connections between the framework units. See also Wright, "Structure," 170, Reese, "Plan and Structure," 394-95, and Schmitt, "Form," 256-57. Reese notes that both 1:1 and 6:1 allude to Psalm 2.

⁵⁰ Schmitt, "Form," 256.

⁵¹ Listed by Kolarcik, *Ambiguity*, 55, and Schmitt, "Form," 252-53, who cites U. Offerhaus, *Komposition und Intention der Sapientia Salomonis* (Bonn, 1981), 291 (unpublished dissertation).

⁵² Schmitt, "Form," 252.

Kaum einem Leser von Weish 1,1-6,21 entgeht der starke Kontrast, der diesen Textteil beherrscht. Zunächst bestimmen Frevler das Geschehen: Sie äußern eine fatalistische Lebenseinstellung, die sie zu ungehemmten Genuß treibt. Ferner sind sie im Besitz der Macht und bekunden aggressive Absichten gegen den armen gerechten und sonstige schwache und hilfsbedürftige Gruppen wie Witwen und alte Menschen (2,10f). Der Gerechte selbst ist in eine passive Rolle ausgesetzt, da er—so darf man wohl schlußfolgern—über keinerlei Einfluß und Rückhalt in der Gesellschaft verfügt. *Dann aber setzt unvermittelt ein Umschwung ein, und die Ereignisse schlagen in das krasse Gegenteil um.* Nach vollzogener Wende sind die ehemaligen Positionen vertauscht: Die einstmals verfolgten Gerechten werden nun rehabilitiert und erfreuen sich einer geachteten und herausgehobenen Stellung, während die übermütigen, stolzen und brutalen Frevler, von früherer Höhe gestürzt, verängstigt und fassungslos ihr verfehltes Leben eingestehen. In einer Schlußszene wird sodann dieser veränderte Zustand komplettiert: Die Gerechten empfangen ewigen Lohn, während die Frevler schmachlich untergehen. Diesem radikalen Wandel des Geschehens mit einer aufsteigenden und fallenden Linie widmet der Verfasser ein nicht unerhebliches Interesse, das sich vor allem in der Komposition niederschlägt.⁵³

The central unit (3:1-4:20) engineers this dramatic reversal: the status of the righteous and wicked is suddenly reversed when God intervenes in judgment. This reversal of status in judgment also brings about the change of mood between the two speeches of the wicked. Moreover, it motivates the instructions to the rulers of the earth in the framework units to seek justice and wisdom or else face certain judgment by God.

Finally, it should be noted that the opening unit, 1:1-15, functions programmatically for the rest of the composition by adumbrating the themes elaborated in subsequent units and expressing the programmatic warning to avoid wickedness or face judgment.⁵⁴ Though *Wisdom* lacks an opening section legitimating its sage and associating his wisdom with the divine sphere, the fiction of Solomonic authorship achieves both of these goals, as is made explicit in 7:7: "Therefore I prayed, and understanding was given me; I called on God, and the spirit of wisdom (πνεῦμα σοφίας) came to me."

⁵³ Schmitt, "Form," 236, my emphases.

⁵⁴ Schmitt, "Form," 247; Reese, "Plan and Structure," 395.

We shall now turn our attention to Q with a view to testing it for the presence of macro arrangements.

Macro-compositions in Q

Eschatological Discourse (Q 12:2-22:30)

This last section of Q, here called the "Eschatological Discourse" because of the interest in revelation of final events that pervades it, has resisted macro-compositional analysis. Some scholars come close to denying that the last section of Q, or large sections of it, displays any encompassing organization at all. Schürmann expresses uncertainty over whether between 12:54-17:19 Luke follows a Q sequence into which he inserts *Sondergut*, or whether he follows a *Sondergut* sequence into which he fits bits of Q material.⁵⁵ Zeller posits a compositional lacuna between 12:53 and 17:23-37 filled with "nicht mehr genau lokalisierbaren Texte...."⁵⁶ Horsley says of the same stretch of Q that "it is difficult to discern how Q materials are 'clustered'...."⁵⁷ Jacobson goes even further and asserts that "from Q 12:2 to the end of Q, following the Lukan order, one is hard pressed to discern any literary unity or structure."⁵⁸ Sato describes the material lying between Q 11:34 and Q 17:23 as "inhaltlich dermaßen undurchsichtig aneinandergereiht" and as unsystematic "Einschüben und Hinzufügungen."⁵⁹ Kloppenborg carries his stratigraphical analysis as far as 14:34-35 (also including 17:23-37), and while noting the excellence of some of the juxtapositions within Q's final section, does not offer a compositional analysis of the final form of the material.⁶⁰ März suggests that after 14:24 "die Q-Akoluthie tritt nicht mehr wie bisher als innere Orientierungslinie in Erscheinung. Die Q-Stoffe begegnen zumeist als Einzeltexte, größere vorlukanische Zusammenhänge lassen sich bis 17,23-37 nicht ausmachen."⁶¹

⁵⁵ Schürmann, "Zeugnis," 160.

⁵⁶ Zeller, *Kommentar*, 15.

⁵⁷ Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 195.

⁵⁸ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 184.

⁵⁹ Sato, *Prophetie*, 43.

⁶⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 148-49, 153, 220, note 201; idem, "Antique Instructional Genres," 148; idem, "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q" *passim*.

⁶¹ März, *Studien*, 81.

However, when one examines the last section of Q for the presence of macro-compositional structuring techniques, the heterogeneous materials resolve themselves neatly into a balanced structure which through both linear sequentialization and ring arrangement of its constituent elements works out a unified instructional strategy: to motivate people to enter the kingdom before it is finally revealed in judgment. Before examining the evidence for this arrangement, however, it is necessary to adduce arguments for the presence of ἔσθητε καὶ πίνετε (not attested in Matt 19:27-29) in Q 22:30.

Following the majority opinion of scholarship, the IQP excludes 22:30a from Q.⁶² Though usually buttressed with other considerations, the most frequently adduced reason for excluding the phrase, "that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom," is that it so closely reflects the Lukan context of the Last Supper and Luke's broader interest in meal scenes that it most likely was added by the evangelist to an original Q saying which spoke only of thrones and judging, as Matthew has it. However, the majority of "Lukan" texts cited to demonstrate that the "eating and drinking" motif is a feature of Lukan redaction are themselves either Q texts or closely attached to Q contexts: 7:33-34, 10:7, 12:29, 45, 13:26, 17:27. Clearly non-Q texts are 5:30b, 33b (Lukan redaction), 14:15, and 17:8, one of which (14:15) is introductory to the Q parable of the Great Banquet. Dennis Smith points out that banqueting was a pervasive motif within the traditions at Luke's disposal in composing his travel narrative.⁶³ This raises a point of criticism of previous reconstructive efforts with regard to Q 22:28-30: the question of the interests and features of Q redaction is virtually never raised let alone factored into the analysis, perhaps because of the pervasive assumption that unlike Matthew and Luke, Q is a rather inchoate collection of traditions and thus does not display a redactional profile on a scale comparable to the evangelists.⁶⁴ If this assumption is set aside, it immediately becomes evident that "eating and

⁶² Evaluator for Q 22:28-30 is Paul Hoffmann; see "Database and Evaluation of Q 22:28-30," in *Documenta Q*, 1-114, esp. 94-95, cited in typescript.

⁶³ Dennis E. Smith, "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke," *JBL* 106 (1987) 613-38, esp. 616, 626-27.

⁶⁴ One can occasionally hear this openly affirmed as an operative principle of analysis.

drinking" are *Leitwörter* of the last section of Q serving to render it a cohesive unity within Q. References to eating and drinking, or feasting, occur (outside the disputed 22:30a) in 12:22, 29, 36-38, 45, 13:26, 29-30, 14:16-24, 17:27-28, 34, and several of these in contexts in which the "Son of Man" or the "Lord" is also in view. By way of contrast, eating in any mode is referred to only twice in the Inaugural Discourse (6:21; 7:33-34), once in the Mission Instruction (10:7-8), and twice in the Controversy Discourse (11:3, 11-12, both in the Prayer Instruction). This concentration of references in the final discourse, therefore, seems due to the redactional strategy of the editor. Correspondingly, the possibility that a motif which figures so prominently across the length of the final discourse might also appear in its final saying should be weighed against the warrants for ascribing it to an *ad hoc* Lukan intervention.

Motif-history research shows that the combination of "eating and drinking" with "judging" is so strongly attested elsewhere that the configuration of these motifs in Q 22:30 can be seen as conventional. Some other occurrences are as follows:

(1) Exod 24:1-14, Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and the seventy elders "ate and drank" (24:11b) in the context of the establishment of the covenant with the "twelve tribes" (24:4). The seventy elders, Aaron, and Hur are then charged with adjudicating the disputes of the tribes in Moses' absence (24:14b; see 18:13-27).

(2) Jer 22:15-16, in a denunciation addressed to the ruling house of Judah, states, "Did not your father eat and drink and do justice and righteousness? Then it was well with him. He judged the cause of the poor and needy, then it was well."

(3) Ezek 44:24 states of the purified priestly class, "In a controversy they shall act as judges, and they shall decide it according to my judgments. They shall keep my laws and my statutes regarding all my appointed festivals, and they shall keep my sabbaths holy."

(4) 1 *Enoch* 62:14, in the middle of a chapter which depicts the Son of Man seated "on the throne of his glory" (62:3) executing judgment upon the wicked, states that "the righteous and elect ones" will "eat and rest and rise with that Son of Man forever and ever."

(5) The *Manual of Discipline*, referring to the Qumran commu-

nal meal which enacts the sect's anticipated leadership in the messianic age, states, "Together they shall eat; together they shall bless; and together they shall take counsel" (1QS 6:2-3), the latter referring to some kind of legislative function.⁶⁵

(6) In Rev 3:20-21 the Son of Man states, "If you hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to you and eat with you and you with me. To the one who conquers I will give a place with me on my throne...." Like Q 22:30, Rev 3:20-21 functions as a promise to those who conduct themselves faithfully until the coming of the Son of Man. Rev 19:9-20:4 also juxtaposes the motifs of feasting and judging.

(7) Hesiod, *Theogony*, 793-803, says that among the penalties imposed on an Olympian god who "perjures himself" is banishment from "the life of the immortals for nine years, never going to share in their councils or in their feasts for nine full years."⁶⁶ Again we encounter judicial-executive function juxtaposed with banqueting.

(8) Pliny the Younger writes to Cornelianus: "I was delighted to be summoned by the Emperor to act as his assessor at Centum Cellae....Nothing could give me more pleasure than to have first-hand experience of our ruler's justice and wisdom....There were several types of cases which tested his judicial powers in various ways...."

"Our days were well spent in serious matters, but we enjoyed our relaxations in the evenings. The Emperor invited us to dinner every day....I took great pleasure in the importance of the cases, the honour of being an assessor, and the charm and informality of our social life...." (Pliny, *Letters* 6.31.1-2, 13-14).⁶⁷ The relationship of the Emperor Trajan and Pliny is that of patron-client; commensality with one's clients was a common means of displaying the patronage for which the client rendered loyalty

⁶⁵ Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*, SBLMS 38 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 53, 56-57; idem, "Communal Meals at Qumran," *RevQ* 10 (1979) 45-56, esp. 50: *wyhd yw'klw wyhd ybrkw wyhd yw'sw*.

⁶⁶ Translation by R. M. Fraser, *The Poems of Hesiod* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983).

⁶⁷ Pliny, *Letters and Panegyricus*, Vol 1., translated by Betty Radice; LCL (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969).

and service, and patronage was the mechanism that enabled clients to achieve status elevation.⁶⁸

(9) A passage from Josephus similarly combines companionship and judicial deputization: "Wishing, moreover, under the guise of friendliness, to retain the Galilaean authorities, some seventy in all, as hostages for the loyalty of the district, I made them my friends and companions in travel, took them as assessors to cases which I tried, and obtained their approbation of the sentences which I pronounced" (*Life*, 79).⁶⁹

Hoffmann notes that the (allegedly) problematic "Vermischung der Bilder (Mahl, Richten)" has been a decisive factor in scholarship's tendency to attribute verse 30a to Lukan redaction, but these parallels effectively dispose of arguments supposing "judging" and "eating" to be oddly and hence secondarily juxtaposed in this saying.⁷⁰ Banqueting and aristocratic judicial prerogatives are indexes of elite status and hence naturally configured together; moreover, they are complementary, even symbiotic, motifs within the semantic field of patronage. Hence 22:30a cannot be assigned to Lukan redaction solely because of the Last Supper context, particularly in view of the possibility that Matthew eliminated verse 30a because of his contextualization of the saying in a non-gastronomic context. Some scholars take the unusual construction of the final clause of 22:30—*ἵνα* + aorist subjunctive + future indicative—as an indicator that 22:30a was inserted later. Actually, as Hoffmann notes, such a construction, though rare, is possible.⁷¹ Moreover, a corresponding negative final clause structure *μήποτε* + subjunctive + future is found both in Q 12:58 and Luke 14:8, 9. Thus, though the beginning of the Q saying in 22:28-29 is effaced, the unusual syntax of verse 30 is not a

⁶⁸ Richard P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge, London, & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 55, 62, 123; Andrew Drummond, "Early Roman *clientes*," in *Patronage in Ancient Society*, edited by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill; Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 1 (London & New York: Routledge, 1989), 89-115, esp. 105.

⁶⁹ Josephus, *The Life*, translated by H. St. J. Thackeray; LCL (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926; reprint 1956, 1976).

⁷⁰ Hoffmann, "Database & Evaluation," 94; see also Jacques Dupont, "Le Logien de douze Trônes (Mt 19,28; Lc 22,28-30)," *Bib* 45 (1964) 355-92, esp. 360 (though acknowledging that "il s'agit sans doute d'idées complémentaires").

⁷¹ Hoffmann, "Database & Evaluation," 93. See BDF § 369 (2)-(3).

definitive indicator that Luke has interpolated the eating and drinking element.⁷² These points indicate that the case for attributing 22:30a to Lukan redaction is considerably weaker than has been imagined, though as is the case with all single-attestation passages, a certain judgment one way or another is beyond reach.

We now turn to the macro arrangement of the Eschatological Discourse which is structured in its entirety to depict an eschatological reversal of status. Though in important respects displaying features of a complex ring composition, we shall see that the rhetoric of this section follows the course of an intelligible linear elaboration, beginning with the opening maxim (12:2) and moving incrementally through sequenced units to culminate in 22:30.

- A. Followers oppressed and judged by hostile authorities, are not to μεριμνήσητε (12:2-12)
 - Son of Man advocate in celestial court (12:8-9)
 - Followers anxious (μεριμνᾶτε) about food and drink (φάγωμεν; πίωμεν) (12:22-34)
 - Followers promised provision in seeking the Kingdom (τὴν βασιλείαν) (12:31)
- B. Servant (δοῦλος) Parables (12:35-46)
 - Son of Man coming (12:40)
 - Servants to be faithful (πιστός)
 - Master (κύριος) absent, but expected
 - Rewards and punishments anticipated
- C. Judgment impending (12:49-59)
 - "I have come to cast fire (πῦρ) on the earth" (12:49)
 - Families sundered (12:51-53)
 - Discern the signs of the times (12:54-56)

⁷² Another point relating to the original form of 22:28-30 is whether Matthew's "Son of Man" or Luke's "me" represents the Q reading. *Documenta Q* (see 93-97) opts for Luke's "me", though in the final analysis the arguments in the database are indecisive. Reconstructions of the saying which eliminate "Son of Man" rely upon the prominence of the Son of Man motif in Matthew's redaction and rarely invoke Q's redactional interests. Q's references to the heavenly, judging Son of Man are concentrated in the last discourse: 12:8-10, 40, 17:24, 30; compare 6:22, 7:33-34, 9:58-60. The last reference is particularly important since it connects the Son of Man with ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, and the reference to "following", according to *Documenta Q*, is also a feature of Q 22:28-30 (ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντες μοι). The point is not critical: the Eschatological Discourse identifies Jesus with the Son of Man; even if the Lukan reading is accepted, the functional identity is not impaired.

Reconcile before judgment (12:57-59)

D. Parable of Mustard Seed (κόκκῳ σινάπεως)
Parable of Leaven (13:18-21)

E. Strive to enter the narrow door (13:24)
Banquet Parable (13:25-29)
Central Sayings: “*The last will be first, and the first will be last. Whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted*”
(13:30; 14:11)
Banquet Parable (14:16-24)
Sayings on Discipleship (14:26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35)

D’ Parable of Lost Sheep (15:4-6)
Parable of Lost Coin (15:8-10)
Serving God or Mammon (16:13)
Law and Divorce (16:16-18)
Scandals (17:1-2)
Forgiveness (17:3-4)
Faith as a Mustard Seed (17:5-6) (κόκκῳ σινάπεως)

C’ Judgment in the Day of the Son of Man (17:23-37)
Discerning signs of the Son of Man’s appearing (17:23-24)
Fire (πῦρ) rains from heaven (17:29)
Divisions and separations (17:34-35)

B’ Servant (δοῦλος) Parable (19:12-25)
Master (κύριος) returns after absence
Rewards for the faithful (πιστός) servants, punishment for unfaithful servant

A’ Son of Man sets up terrestrial kingdom (θρόνου/βασιλεία) (22:28-30)
Followers become authorities judging Israel (καθήσονται ἐπὶ θρόνων κρίνοντες)
[Followers eat and drink (ἔσθιτε καὶ πίνετε) at Son of Man’s table in his kingdom]

The individual instructional speeches demarcated in the last chapter make up a number of the constituent building blocks of this macro arrangement, and its remaining units are form-critically

distinct, that is, *the large composition is built up out of building blocks defined by the smaller literary units*. The first framework unit, made up of two instructions: 12:2-12 and 12:22-34, is an exception. These, however, are bound together by the key motif-word *μεριμνᾶν*. The basis of the composition—and the starting point for its analysis—is thus the form-critical and lexical characteristics of its constituent elements.

The first framework unit (12:2-12; 22-34) is as noted made up of two instructions linked by the motif-word *μεριμνᾶν*: the problem of anxiety is treated in situations of oppression, prospect of death, or mortality, and want respectively.⁷³ *Ps.-Phoc.* 97-121, a single instructional unit, features admonitions to face the hardships of life and the certainty of death with the cardinal virtue of fortitude (or courage) and to use wealth wisely in the face of one's mortality.⁷⁴ Philo treats poverty and subsistence under the cardinal virtue of courage (*On the Virtues*, 5-6).⁷⁵ This is the same collocation of motifs as is found in Q 12:2-12, 22-34.

The correspondence between framework units is signaled by recurrent key words and motifs.⁷⁶ As was at times observed in the comparative texts, the relationship between the framework units is *inversionary*, for a striking reversal of power and status relationships takes place between them. In 12:2-12 the followers of the Son of Man are subjected to deadly judgment at the hand of the authorities (Luke 12:11b: *συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας*; compare Matt 10:17-18). In Q 22:30b the followers of the Son of Man have suddenly become the authorities in Israel, who "sit on [twelve] thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."⁷⁷ In 12:22-34, the low-status followers of Jesus face hunger and thirst. In 22:30a, the followers of the Son of Man

⁷³ Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 121; Sato, *Prophetie*, 41. *Διορύσσουσιν* (12:33) and *διορυχθῆναι* (12:39) link 12:16-34 with 12:35-46, but "dig through" is not a thematically crucial catchword as *μεριμνᾶν* clearly is. The recurrence of "dig through" is better taken as a *mot crochet* associatively linking the second and third instructional speeches.

⁷⁴ Wilson, *Mysteries*, 108-12. See also *Syr. Men.* 368-396.

⁷⁵ Philo, *On the Virtues*, in *Philo*, Vol. VIII, trans. F. H. Colson; LCL (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press, 1939; 1960).

⁷⁶ For those familiar with such framework arrangements the dissimilarity in size is not an issue.

⁷⁷ See Fleddermann, "End of Q," 7.

recline at table, eating and drinking, it may be assumed, to satiety. The oppressed have become the rulers, the poor have received the kingdom, and the hungry have been filled. The promises of 12:8-9 of a future vindication by the Son of Man and of 12:31 of provision for those who seek the kingdom are super-abundantly realized in 22:28-30. The framework units, viewed together, coordinate the motifs of oppressive authorities and the Son of Man's judgment, producing thereby the same combination as is found in *1 Enoch*, particularly the Book of Similitudes (see *1 Enoch* 38:1-6; 46:3-8; 48:8-10; 62:1-16; 63:1-12).

With the inversion between the framework units clearly in view, attention is drawn to the gnomic sayings in the heart of the composition: "The last shall be first and the first shall be last. Whoever exalts himself shall be humbled, and whoever humbles himself shall be exalted." These twinned sayings express gnomically the reversal of status elaborated in the framework units. In a manner similar to the smaller instructional speeches, the Eschatological Discourse, itself a large composite instruction, utilizes gnomic sayings which succinctly express the elaborative thrust of the composition. With eating, drinking, and banquets profiled in the framework units, it is no accident that these central gnomes are themselves framed by two banquet parables (13:25-29; 14:16-20), both of which depict the reversal of status elaborated in the framework.

This arrangement of framework units and central gnomic sayings works out an implied narrative movement from present to future through a crux in which relations of status and power are reversed. A setting in which hostile authorities sit in judgment gives way to a setting in which the Son of Man has instituted his kingdom and his authority-endowed followers eat, drink, and judge with him. It is also possible to detect a corresponding spatial movement from heaven to earth: in 12:2-12 the Son of Man appears to be in heaven either with the angels or with his Father, whereas in 22:28-30 the Son of Man sets up a terrestrial kingdom centering around the twelve tribes of Israel.

Linear, or sequential, elaboration is equally prominent and in harmony with the ring arrangements. Q 22:28-30 elaborates on the promise made by the returned master to his faithful servants in 19:12-26 that they would be "set over much." This franchise to exercise authority (22:28-30) is contingent upon the faithful-

ness urged in the Parable of the Entrusted Money.⁷⁸ At the beginning of the Discourse, the assurances of care in 12:2-12, 22-34 are similarly qualified by the servant parables of 12:35-46 which exhort to faithfulness.

From the perspective of the ring arrangement, deployed by the editor to manage in a rhetorically significant way the disparate materials which make up the Discourse, the two succeeding units (12:35-46; 19:12-26) constitute a tight pair. Q 12:35-46 is an instructional speech while 19:12-26 is likewise a wisdom form—a parable with a gnomic moral attached.⁷⁹ Servant parables constitute the bulk of both units. The key words, motifs, and semantic configurations articulated in 12:35-46 reappear in 19:12-26. Both parables rotate around the activities of servants in the absence of the master and a reckoning when the master returns.⁸⁰ Both contrast the behavior of trustworthy with untrustworthy servants. Both urge faithfulness in the master's absence and announce rewards that entail an astounding rise in status—served at table by the master himself; placed in charge of all the master's possessions; set in charge of much. Correspondingly, both envision a horrific punishment entailing severe loss of status as retribution for unfaithfulness.⁸¹ In this respect the gnomic “reversal of status” sayings located at the center of the macro composition (13:30; 14:11) are the center of gravity around which these units orbit as well. Finally, both 12:35-46 and 19:12-26 are directed to the community itself, employing the metaphor of a household and estate functioning profitably and harmoniously in the absence of the master to prod the Q group to faithfulness in their Lord's absence.⁸²

Despite these formal and thematic similarities, an important difference distinguishes the two units. On the one hand, 12:35-46 is anticipatory: the master is absent from the household but

⁷⁸ Crossan, *In Fragments*, 203-204; Schenk, *Synopse*, 130; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 242; Kloppenborg, “Social History,” 93.

⁷⁹ See *Babrius and Phaedrus*, trans. Ben Edwin Perry, LCL, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984); Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 50.

⁸⁰ Polag, *Christologie*, 165.

⁸¹ Kloppenborg, “Parables of Jesus,” 294; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 242; Piper, *Wisdom*, 146-47.

⁸² Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 294; Edwards, *Theology*, 144 (Edwards' notion that the Parable of the Entrusted Money in Q was directed to outsiders must be rejected).

expected soon. Q 19:12-26, on the other hand, describes events after the master returns; it records the reckoning the master holds with his servants. Thus linear elaborative movement takes place: the master is absent and the servants are active in various ways. Then the master returns and holds an assize in which he rewards or punishes his servants.

A sequential compositional logic controls the relationships of these with other units in the final discourse. The epitomizing pronouncement of 12:35-46, "The Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not expect" (12:40), foreshadows the depiction of the Son of Man's sudden coming given in graphic detail in 17:24-37. The harsh threat of judgment on the unfaithful servant (12:46) prepares for the ominous foreshadowings of impending judgment delivered in the next instruction (12:49-59), though with attention shifted to outsiders.⁸³ Kloppenborg observes that 19:12-26 continues to elaborate the theme of loss at judgment introduced in the "apocalypse" of 17:23-37.⁸⁴

Key word connections between 12:49-59 and 17:23-37 are weak, yet the motif connections are unequivocal. Q 12:49 announces the imminent casting of fire (πῦρ) upon the earth, and 17:29 describes the incineration of Sodom (πῦρ) in an identical heaven-to-earth direction, though the force of this connection is diminished by the problematic Q-status of both 12:49 and 17:28-29.⁸⁵ Q 12:51-53 portrays Sunderings of the closest social bonds brought on by the crisis of Jesus' announcement of judgment; Q 17:34-35 similarly depicts people in intimate social relationships torn from one another in the day of judgment itself.⁸⁶ One unit urges discernment of the "present time" (12:54-56); the other likewise is predicated upon the need to properly discern the day of the Son of Man (17:23-24).

These units contribute to the linear elaborative movement down

⁸³ März, *Studien*, 18-19. Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 198, notes that the key word "come" (ἔρχομαι...ἐλθὼν...ἦξει...ἦλθον) connects 12:39-46 with 12:49 and that διχάζειν in 12:53 may echo διχοτομεῖν in 12:46. These may be other examples of "hook-words".

⁸⁴ Kloppenborg, "Social History," 93; idem, "Parables of Jesus," 298-99.

⁸⁵ It is noteworthy, however, that πῦρ, rare as it is in Q, recurs precisely in 12:49 and 17:29.

⁸⁶ Noted by Geiger, *Endzeitreden*, 138; see also Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 212.

the length of the discourse. The opening verse of the first, 12:49, is tense with anticipation of impending judgment,⁸⁷ while 12:57-59 urges action in view of this. The individual addressed is "on the way"; judgment is imminent; resolution is urged before the court passes its verdict. Q 17:23-37, in contrast, depicts graphic scenes of actualized judgment in the "day of the Son of Man." The sense of anticipation that charges the former has virtually disappeared in the latter, which now visualizes the catastrophe by appropriating paradigmatic scenes of judgment on Noah's generation and Sodom. In 12:51-53 divisions in families are presented as the price to be paid for heeding Jesus' message of crisis and judgment; 17:34-35 ironically presents the alternative: the inevitable separations which judgment will bring. Either one accepts social divisions now as the price of saving adherence to Jesus or one suffers the more horrible separations accompanying judgment.

As we determined in the preceding chapter, outsiders are the target audience of both 12:49-59 and 17:23-37. In contrast to 12:35-46 and 19:12-26, where judgment is visited upon the household servants by the master, 17:23-37 chooses the paradigmatic examples of wicked human society, Noah's generation and Sodom, to exemplify the society contemporaneous with the Q group and threaten it with judgment. This elucidates the compositional logic of the sequencing of these with adjoining units. Q 12:35-46 and 19:12-26 tell the Q community that it ought to live in the present in light of a future reckoning with its Master. With 12:49-59 and 17:23-37 Q turns to address the society outside the boundaries of the sect, calling it to an irrevocable, revolutionary decision in light of the cataclysmic judgment about to fall upon it.

The Q editor has signaled a macro-compositional relationship between 13:18-21 and 15:4-10; 16:13; 17:1b-6 by means of a "mustard seed" framework in 13:19 and 17:6 (κόκκῳ σινάπεως.... κόκκον σινάπεως). Moreover both the Mustard Seed and Leaven parables and the admonition to great deeds from faith as a mustard seed (17:5-6) are based on the contrast between "small" and "great" and depict events in which final results disproportionately overshadow minute beginnings.⁸⁸ Both 13:18-21 and 17:5-

⁸⁷ März, *Studien*, 16, 19; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 151.

⁸⁸ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 204.

6, therefore, pick up the contrastive "reversal" motif articulated in the central gnomic sayings (13:30; 14:11).

Both incorporate a double parable: the Mustard Seed and the Leaven, constituting the whole of 13:18-21, and the Lost Sheep and the Lost Drachma in 15:4-10. Similarly to 13:18-21 (and 17:5-6), the Lost Sheep and Lost Drachma are based upon a contrastive differential, in this case, of quantity between the one and the many. Thus three formal elements of 13:18-21—the mustard seed motif, small-large contrast, and double parable construction—reappear in 15:4-10; 16:13; 17:1b-6, specifically at its beginning and end.

The fact that the beginning (15:4-10) and end (17:5-6) of the latter are so strongly reminiscent of 13:18-21, added to the fact that both 15:4-10 and 17:5-6 incorporate a quantity-differential motif, serves to create a framework which encloses the more heterogeneous paraenetic material between them (16:13, 16-18; 17:1-4), thus giving unity to the whole and defining it as a discrete compositional unit. This profile of the enclosed materials matches Berger's genre description of "paraenesis":

Diese Mahnungen sind stets verhältnismäßig kurz, daher auch häufig unbegründet, die Anreihung geschieht ohne syntaktische Verbindung. Die Reihung geschieht dennoch nicht wahllos, sondern die gereihten Elemente sind zumeist formal gleichartig, und sie umfassen bestimmte Themenbereiche....Sollen verschiedene Themenbereiche abgesteckt werden, so geschieht das im Nacheinander. Inhaltlich geht es regelmäßig um stark traditionelle, konventionelle Normen. Die Function paränetischer Reihen ist daher die Erinnerung an allgemeine Verhaltensnormen.⁸⁹

⁸⁹ Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 121; see also idem, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1075-78, where he notes that in "paraenesis" admonitions are "nicht ausführlich begründet" (1076). This genre description explains why this section is not structured as an instructional speech and satisfactorily responds to Piper's concern that "the absence of any supporting argument...does cast doubt upon its 'wisdom style'" (*Wisdom*, 113). Naturally questions arise about the place of the "law" sayings (16:16-17) within this speech. However, it is not necessarily odd, in a Jewish context, for a section devoted to paraenesis to contain a statement vis à vis the group's view of the status of the Torah; Q 16:17 functions in this manner in the Sermon on the Mount. The motif of the violence suffered by the Kingdom (16:16) enunciates two themes important to the last section of Q: the arrival of the Kingdom and the opposition which it encounters (see 12:2-12), and thus serves to integrate the speech into the final section and to

Some Q-scholars have suggested that much of this material constitutes a unit,⁹⁰ though only Kloppenborg (to my knowledge) designates 15:4-17:6 an "entire section" by positing a close connection between the Lost Sheep and Lost Drachma parables and the paraenetic themes which follow.⁹¹ Both the parables and the Scandals saying elevate and honor the insignificant "one," and the obvious status differential between offender and the offended in the Scandals saying reflects the "small-large" contrast which controls 17:5-6 as well as 15:4-10.⁹² Accordingly, Kloppenborg notes that this paraenesis challenges existing status relations, a challenge articulated in the opening parables, where importance of the "one" over against the "many" is asserted and then specified in the paraenesis which follows as elevation of those of low social status. Q 16:18, for example, redraws status positions, "underscoring the honour of the lesser (female) partner in marriage over against that of the dominant partner."⁹³ Again, the

anchor the paraenesis in a particular eschatological world view. The "law" sayings are themselves framed by sayings against avarice (16:13) and in support of marriage (16:18). Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paränese*, 63, 107, states that keeping oneself pure from immorality and greed was viewed as the central demand of the Law in early Jewish texts. Thomas, *Phokylides*, 92, names the triad εἰδωλολατρία, πορνεία, πλεονεξία as central to Hellenistic-Jewish paraenesis. Q 16:13 combines treatment of the vices of avarice and idolatry. Thus, Q 15:4-17:6 appears to be a quite conventional Jewish paraenetic composition, setting out the group's position on the Torah and offering paraenesis against the three cardinal vices. For theories of the compositional history of 16:16-18 see Christopher Tuckett, "Q, the Law, and Judaism," in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of Law in Israel and Early Christianity*, ed. Barnabas Lindars (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988), 90-102, John S. Kloppenborg, "Nomos and Ethos in Q," in *Gospel Origins and Christian Beginnings: In Honor of James M. Robinson*, eds. James E. Goehring et al. (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1990), 35-48, idem, "Social History," 99-100, and Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 435-43.

⁹⁰ Schürmann, "Zeugnis," 170; see also Crossan, *In Fragments*, 273-74, and Polag, *Christologie*, 14.

⁹¹ Kloppenborg, "Parables of Jesus," 317.

⁹² Kloppenborg, "Parables of Jesus," 316. Failure to appraise the connection of the parables with the paraenesis which follows has led Q scholars to produce a wide range of mutually irreconcilable interpretations of the Lost Sheep parable in particular. See Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 389-91, Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 226, David R. Catchpole, "The Whole People of God," in David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 189-200, esp. 196-97, and Schenk, *Synopse*, 113.

⁹³ Kloppenborg, "Parables of Jesus," 315-16; idem, "Alms, Debt and Divorce: Jesus' Ethics in their Mediterranean Context," *TJT* 6 (1990) 182-200, esp. 195-96.

status-alteration motif expressed by the gnomic sayings at the center of the macro-arrangement is seen to pervade this paraenetic unit also, in this case shaping the paraenetic program of the Q group.

The parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven likewise envision a radical alteration of status. The growth images of a tiny seed becoming a large tree and a pinch of leaven permeating a large batch of dough express the self-understanding of the Q group; that is, they metaphorically express the sect's belief that it is the vanguard of the Kingdom about to be fully and suddenly revealed, with the group revealed as the elect eschatological community. Though its present status is one of smallness and insignificance, even hiddenness, the group marvelously (and as ineluctably as the course of nature evident in the growth of plants and the leavening power of yeast) will be elevated to rule.⁹⁴ However, the parables' linear placement in anticipation of the paraenetic units attaches a certain contingency to the realization of this elevated future status. The Q group is indeed the eschatological community, but whose present ethical life will embody the principles articulated in 15:4-10; 16:13, 16-18; 17:1b-6. The marvelous dynamisms of nature which produce startling growth and effervescence become symbols for the ethical dynamism of the sect, charged by a faith which believes the impossible can occur.⁹⁵

Both units connect sequentially with adjoining materials, answering the doubts of some scholars with respect to the original Q context of 13:18-21.⁹⁶ The affinity of the Mustard Seed and Leaven parables with the Eschatological Discourse is clear from the fact that they pick up the motif, sounded at the outset in the discourse's programmatic maxim (12:2), of something hidden

⁹⁴ Luise Schottroff, "Wanderprophetinnen," 336-37; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 223, note 214; idem, "Parables of Jesus," 309; Wendy Cotter, "The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven: Their Function in the Earliest Stratum of Q," *TJT* 8 (1992) 38-51, esp. 45; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 41; Manson, *Sayings*, 123; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 178; Zeller, *Kommentar*, 82; Schenk, *Synopse*, 101; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 302-305; Schürmann, "Zeugnis," 162-63; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 203-205.

⁹⁵ See Kloppenborg, "Parables of Jesus," 316, and Schenk, *Synopse*, 118-19.

⁹⁶ See März, *Studien*, 14, 78-80, idem, "Q Rezeption," 187, Schürmann, "Zeugnis," 160-61, Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 190, and Zeller, *Kommentar*, 82.

ineluctably revealed.⁹⁷ Moreover, the growth parables of 13:18-21 are quite at home in their location before the Enter Through the Narrow Door instructional speech. "Few" enter the "narrow door"; yet the kingdom will be like a well-attended banquet.⁹⁸ März notes that the catchword βασιλεία connects 13:18-19 with 13:28-29 and that the image of birds coming and nesting in the branches is apposite to the concourse of people coming to banquet from the four corners of the earth.⁹⁹ Finally, the parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven, which portray the emergence of the Kingdom, are conveniently followed by the Enter Through the Narrow Door instruction, which explains how one gains entry to the kingdom. The connection of 13:18-21 backward to 12:49-59 (Discerning the Times) is less clear,¹⁰⁰ though the recurrence of βληθήση/βαλεῖ (12:58; see also βαλεῖν in Luke 12:49 and Matt 10:34)...ἔβαλεν (13:19) may indicate a catchword association.¹⁰¹

The Enter Through the Narrow Door instruction is located in the middle of the Eschatological Discourse. Its crucial function in the macro composition is closely connected to features of its own composition. The middle sayings of the instruction (13:30; 14:11) are by definition embedded in the middle of the entire Discourse. As such they articulate gnominically the dramatic reversal of status expressed in the framework units, in which the marginalized, oppressed members of the group are raised to become those who sit on thrones judging Israel, while those currently of high position and who judge the Q group are utterly reduced through a catastrophic judgment. Most of the other units give some expression to this change-of-status motif articulated at the center. The gnomonic units also function correlatively for the linear elaboration of the discourse: in the first part the Q group is the "last," while in the second they become the "first" (vice versa for those outside the group).

The two banqueting scenes (13:25-29; 14:16-24) which flank

⁹⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 223, note 214; idem, "Social History," 83-84; idem, "Parables of Jesus," 311.

⁹⁸ Williams, "Parable and Chreia," 100. See the discussion in chapter three.

⁹⁹ März, "Q Rezeption," 183.

¹⁰⁰ Kloppenborg, "Parables of Jesus," 309, notes that in 13:18-21 "there is no hint of the threats or ominous tones that permeate 12:39-59...."

¹⁰¹ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 203.

the central gnomes illustrate the reversals of expectations and status which are the theme of the entire discourse. Moreover, in the first scene the judge who executes the reversal of status makes a pronouncement (13:26-27); thus in the midst of the festivity sounds the somber note of judgment, soon to be graphically depicted as the "day of the Son of Man" (17:24-37). In addition, the banqueting scenes pick up the "Kingdom" and the "eating and drinking" themes which appear primarily in the framework units, but also here and there in other parts of the complex (12:36-46; 17:26-28, 34).

Finally, it is surely no accident that in a large instructional complex so overshadowed by the threat of impending, horrific judgment an instruction urging listeners to "enter through the narrow door" should appear prominently at the center where it articulates the major deliberative issue at stake in such a crisis: rigorous adherence to Jesus in committed discipleship.

The appearance of the device of the coordinating "gnomic center" which epitomizes the instructional concerns of the macro-composition reminds us that the same phenomenon was a crucial element in the composition of Q's smaller instructional speeches. Another compositional—and genre-specific—feature of the small instructional speeches likewise recurs in the Eschatological Discourse: the device of the *programmatic maxim*: "Nothing is covered which will not be revealed and hidden which will not be made known" (12:2).¹⁰² Like the programmatic maxims or admonitions of the smaller instructions, 12:2 is enigmatic and hermeneutically open-ended. The discourse which follows, beginning with the disciples' courageous testimony (12:3-12), and concluding with final judgment in the "day the Son of Man is revealed" (17:30) and the establishment of the Son of Man's kingdom with his followers as co-regents (22:30), elaborates on the "hidden" thing which ineluctably will be "revealed," namely, the Kingdom, the revelation of which is expressed parabolically in the Mustard Seed and the Leaven parables.¹⁰³ The movement from "hidden" to "revealed," central to the maxim, itself expresses the change of status which is the controlling theme of the discourse. Though in important respects organized as a complex

¹⁰² See Kloppenborg, "Antique Instructional Genres," 151.

¹⁰³ See Hoffmann, *Studien*, 132.

ring composition, the dominant feature of the Eschatological Discourse is precisely this cohesive, coherent *linear elaborative movement* from “hidden” to “revealed” which enacts a unified rhetorical (simultaneously *protreptic* and *paraenetic*) strategy. This implements a wide-spread literary convention: “The introduction of an omen or portent, or the device of making a whole story the fulfillment of a prophecy given at the beginning....Such a device suggests...a conception of ineluctable fate or hidden omnipotent will. Actually, it is a piece of pure literary design, giving the beginning some symmetrical relationship with the end...”¹⁰⁴ Thus if one is predisposed to find concentric composition proposals incommensurable, one can find much to appreciate in the uni-directional elaboration developing incrementally from the beginning of the discourse to its end.

Finally, the fact that (a) a wisdom form—the maxim—stands in the governing, inaugurating position, and (b) the majority of the smaller, constituent compositions are either instructional speeches or loose paraenesis, mandates classifying the Eschatological Discourse as an extended instruction which utilizes the threat of judgment to motivate people to enter the Kingdom and live there responsibly in anticipation of the revelation of the Son of Man from heaven. Moreover, the Discourse’s constituent instructional speeches treat a range of wisdom topoi: courage and fortitude, death, agriculture, use of wealth, marriage, servants and masters, family relationships, banquets and hospitality, status transformations, and appropriate discernment and use of the times.¹⁰⁵ Status change and reversals of fortune are themselves stock topics for sapiential reflection.¹⁰⁶ It is the conviction of impending crisis, expectation of an imminent reversal, and corresponding sense of alienation from doomed contemporary society and its conventional values that renders the performance of these topoi so idiosyncratic, or better, aphoristic. Conventional wisdom and the values it supports, oriented toward sustaining the present order, find no place in a composition that envisions the imminent end of that order and establishment of another.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 139.

¹⁰⁵ Derron, *Sentences*, xxvi-xxvii, describes such topoi as “les thèmes fondamentaux de toute gnomologie.”

¹⁰⁶ On this see Beardslee, “Uses of the Proverb,” 66-67.

¹⁰⁷ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 318-20, Edwards, *Theology*, passim, März, “Q Rezeption,” 195, Perdue, “Social Character of Paraenesis,” 14, Gerd Theissen,

Q's Eschatological Discourse conforms closely in both structure and motifs to *Wis* 1:1-6:21 (see above). Schmitt's characterization of the opening section of *Wisdom*, "Der Vollzug einer radikalen Wende und somit einer Umkehrung bisheriger Verhältnisse wird eindrucksvoll dargestellt," is equally apt as a characterization of this discourse.¹⁰⁸ Both make reference to rulers in their framework units. In both the righteous appear initially as marginalized and oppressed by the wicked, a situation suddenly reversed by judgment. In both compositions this reversal of status is expressed in the central unit, and both structures incorporate the tension between present and future.¹⁰⁹ Both are extended instructions which utilize the threat of judgment to provoke a correct response to deliberative issues seen to be of importance.

To be sure, important differences distinguish the Q and *Wisdom of Solomon* compositions. *Wisdom* does not depict the decisive reversal of status gnominically. The inversion of status in *Wisdom* does not affect the status of the current rulers, who are addressed in both framework units with their status unchanged; rather, the motif of status-reversal through judgment is used as a warning to motivate obedience to the admonitions to the current rulers to seek righteousness (1:1-15) and wisdom (6:1-21), while Q much more intently anticipates the radical alteration of the present structures of its society by the full manifestation of the Kingdom. These differences are performancial and do not affect the fact that both Q 12:2-22:30 and *Wis* 1:1-6:21 treat a wisdom topos (status change) and work with similar constellations of motifs within the compass of similar macro arrangements.

The book of Esther enacts the same status-reversal plot in narrative form and like the Eschatological Discourse and *Wis* 1:1-6:21 locates the reversal of status in a central unit in which Mordecai is exalted by the king and Haman is humbled (6:1-14).¹¹⁰ In a manner strikingly similar to the Q composition, this

"Jesusbewegung als charismatische Wertrevolution," *NTS* 35 (1989) 343-60, and Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 67.

¹⁰⁸ Schmitt, "Form," 253.

¹⁰⁹ Schmitt, "Form," 238.

¹¹⁰ See Michael V. Fox, *Character and Ideology in the Book of Esther* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 73, 82, William T. McBride, "Esther Passes: Chiasm, Lex Talio, and Money in the Book of Esther," in "Not in Heaven": *Coherence and Complexity in Biblical Narrative*, eds. Jason P. Rosenblatt and Joseph C. Sitterson Jr. (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University

reversal is framed by two banquet scenes.¹¹¹ As in the Eschatological Discourse, feasting is a recurrent motif in Esther where banquets “are the sites of important events which signal shifts of power.”¹¹² Like the Q composition, the reversal of status in Esther marks a turn in the fortunes of God’s people.¹¹³

All three of Q 12:2-22:30, *Wis* 1:1-6:21, and Esther are seen to enact a similar plot sequence: (1) persecution of the righteous by the wicked; (2) reversal whereby the wicked are debased and the righteous vindicated and exalted. This similarity is due to the fact that this plot is conventional, even archetypal within early Jewish literature.¹¹⁴ Nickelsburg identifies recurrent features of this plot as being accusation, conspiracy, trial, condemnation, rescue, vindication, exaltation, judgment, and punishment, and identifies its presence (in addition to *Wisdom* and Esther) in the Joseph story (Gen 37-42), *Ahikar*, Dan 3, 6, 1 *Enoch* 94-104, 2 *Macc* 7, and 3 *Macc*.¹¹⁵ Clearly the heterogeneous materials comprising Q 12:2-22:30 are arranged in such a manner as to perform a version of this plot; hence the Eschatological Discourse should be added to the list of compositions in early Jewish literature which incorporate it.

Press, 1991), 211-23, 254-55, note 7, and Sandra Beth Berg, *The Book of Esther: Motifs, Themes and Structure*, SBLDS 44 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 98-111.

¹¹¹ See Fox, *Character*, 162: “...turning point [6:10]...bracketed between Esther’s two banquets....”

¹¹² Fox, *Character*, 156; see also Berg, *Esther*, 31-35.

¹¹³ Berg, *Esther*, 96-97, 105. Robert H. O’Connell, “Isaiah XIV 4B-23: Ironic Reversal Through Concentric Structure and Mythic Allusion,” *VT* 38 (1988) 407-18, esp. 407-408, has proposed another instance of a reversal of status.

¹¹⁴ Frye’s description of the “flood archetype” as a literary structuring principle may be applicable within this framework as well: “This usually takes the form of some cosmic disaster destroying the whole fictional society except a small group, which begins life anew in some sheltered spot” (*Anatomy of Criticism*, 203).

¹¹⁵ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, Harvard Theological Studies 26 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1972), 48-69. See also Hans-Peter Müller, “Die weisheitliche Lehrerzählung im Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt,” *WO* 9 (1977-78) 77-98: “Konflikt....Tugendbewährung....Bestrafung der Antihelden....Belohnung des Helden.”

Controversy Discourse (Q 10:23-24; 11:2-13, 14-23, 24-26, 29-35, 39-52; 13:34-35)

Q scholarship has long recognized that the smaller compositions located in the Controversy Discourse have been redacted to form longer stretches of discourse. Lührmann designates the Beelzebul controversy (11:14-23), the Return of the Unclean Spirit (11:24-26), and the Request for a Sign (up to 11:32) a "großen Einheit" and "ein erweitertes Apophthegma, beginnend mit der Heilungsgeschichte und auf das Drohwort hinzielend."¹¹⁶ Laufen postulates that "der Q-Redaktor hat durch die Verbindung der Beelzebul- mit der Zeichenforderungssperikope eine große zusammenhängende Einheit zum Thema 'Ungläubige Ablehnung Jesu' geschaffen."¹¹⁷ Kloppenborg sees in these units along with 11:33-36, 39-52 "a lengthy block of Q material" thematically unified by censure of "this generation".¹¹⁸ Moreover, Kloppenborg suggests that the editor has created macro structuration by setting "the Beelzebul accusation and the request for a sign/sayings on light in parallel."¹¹⁹ In addition, all three units (Beelzebul, Request for a Sign, and Woes) "end on a threatening note and prediction of a decisive judgment upon impenitent Israel."¹²⁰ Jacobson, Polag, and Kosch likewise posit a composition unified by the motif of controversy running from 11:14 to 11:52, though Polag and Kosch view it as the end result of multi-stage agglomerative expansion.¹²¹ Schürmann extends the boundary of this macro

¹¹⁶ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 43.

¹¹⁷ Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 147.

¹¹⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 121, 147.

¹¹⁹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 147.

¹²⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 148. Kloppenborg takes 11:24-26 as the culmination of 11:14-23. Vassiliadis, "Original Order," 384, sees it as the middle member of a tripartite chiasmic structure comprised of the Beelzebul controversy (a), Return of the Unclean Spirit (x), and the Request for a Sign (a').

¹²¹ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 182; Polag, *Christologie*, 13; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 82-83, 178, 191. Kosch, building upon a suggestion by Zeller, *Mahn-sprüche*, 191, note 233; idem, *Kommentar*, 72-73, develops a complex redaction history in which 11:33 and 12:2-3 (and possibly 12:8-10) formed an early composition on proclamation later expanded by the insertion of 11:34-36 (and at the same time 12:4-10 to 12:3), which set off a chain reaction of redactional events whereby the Woes were inserted and the newly expanded sayings group 11:29-36 was attached to the Beelzebul controversy on the other end (*Eschatologische Tora*, 78-81). Kosch finds the presence of 11:34-36 and 11:39-52 between 11:33 and 12:2ff disturbing to the primitive elaboration of confession and pro-

composition forward to include 13:34-35, which together with the announcement of judgment in 11:49-51 supplies an emphatic finale to the Beelzebul and Sign controversies (themselves earlier redactional compositions) which precede it. The creation of the encompassing composition likely was the act of the "Endredaction" of Q.¹²²

Each of these proposals has valuable elements which can be incorporated into the analysis which follows. Common to all of them, however, is reluctance to move the boundary of this section back behind 11:14 to include the Prayer instruction (11:2-13) or any of the material from Q 10, usually because of *thematic* considerations which seem to indicate, logically enough, that "a totally new subject does not emerge until the Beelzebul Controversy...which opens a large section dealing with Jesus' relation to his opponents (see Lk 11.14-54)."¹²³ However, as Sato notes, this leaves the redactional logic for the Prayer instruction's (11:2-13) present location obscure, for it is not clearly part of the Mission Discourse.¹²⁴ When the text is examined for the presence of text-structuring devices such as lexical, semantic, motif, and form-critical recurrence, a macro arrangement emerges which begins with 10:23-24 and continues (as Schürmann proposes) to 13:34-35:

A. Sightedness, presence (10:23-24)

"Blessed are the eyes which see what you see" (μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε).

"For truly I tell you (ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν) that many prophets (προφῆται) and kings desired to see what you see, and did not see it (ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν), and to hear what you hear, and did not hear it" (10:23-24).

B. Prayer Instruction (11:2-13)

"Knock and it will be opened to you" (11:9-10)

Access in prayer to the Father

mation carried out by the primitive juxtaposition (this provokes his redaction-history solution), but the alleged insertion only creates a disturbance if one premises the primitive connection in the first place.

¹²² Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.327-8, 333-34; idem, "QLk 11,14-36," 566, 582; idem, "Die Redekomposition wider 'dieses Geschlecht'," 67, 74. An earlier redaction added 11:34-35(36), a "Nach-Wort", which created a structured composition out of 11:14-36 ("QLk 11,14-36," 582).

¹²³ Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 95.

¹²⁴ Sato, *Prophetie*, 39.

Household

Daily bread, forgiveness of debts (11:2-4)

Poverty

Purity (ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομα)

C. Beelzebul Controversy (11:14-23)

Challenge and riposte chreia with agents of censure

"Therefore, they shall be your judges" (κριταί)

"The kingdom of God has come upon you."

D. Return of the Unclean Spirit (11:24-26)

Central Saying: "The last state of that person becomes worse than the first" (11:26b)

C' Demand for Sign Controversy (11:29-35)

Challenge and riposte chreia with agents of censure

"The Queen of the South...men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it"

(ἐν τῇ κρίσει...καὶ κατακρινεῖ)

"Something greater than Solomon/Jonah is here."

B' Denunciation of Official Purity Apparatus and Cult (11:39-52)

"You have taken away the key of knowledge; you did not enter nor permit to enter those who were trying to enter" (11:52).

Obstructed access to God

Temple

Tithes of mint, dill, cummin (11:42)

Wealth and avariciousness (11:39b, 47-48)

Pollution (11:39b-40, 44, 51)

A' Blindness, withdrawal of presence (13:34-35)

"Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets (τοὺς προφῆτας)..., how often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings and you refused! Behold, your house is forsaken."

"I tell you (λέγω ὑμῖν) you will not see me (οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με) until the time comes when you say, 'Blessed (εὐλογημένος) is he who comes in the name of the Lord!'"

As was the case with the Eschatological Discourse, the smaller literary units form the constituent units of the larger redactional architecture. Also like the Eschatological Discourse, the Controversy Discourse employs the techniques of frameworking and ring composition to organize its disparate elements. We shall see that the macro composition works out in a linear, escalating manner

a coherent, socially aggressive rhetorical strategy of *counter-definition* and *delegitimization*.

Form-critical, key word, and motif recurrence as well as antithesis establish the compositional connection between the framework units (10:23-24; 13:34-35).¹²⁵ Both units contain a macarism (μακάριοι/εὐλογημένος). The first macarism opens the discourse while the second macarism closes it.¹²⁶ This is quite conventional; in ancient Jewish literature “blessings” or hymnic elements frequently inaugurate or bring to climactic closure extended text segments.¹²⁷ A λέγω ὑμῖν saying occurs in both framework units. Lexical recurrence is particularly thick and centers around the noun προφήται and verbs of seeing (οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε; ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν/οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με). Most striking in this regard is the *inversion* that occurs between the framework units: in 10:23-24 a blessed sightedness is granted to an elect group; in 13:34-35 sightedness is denied another group, metonymically represented by “Jerusalem, who kills the prophets.”¹²⁸ This creates a linear progression (or better, regression) from sight (οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε) to blindness (μὴ ἴδητέ με), and with respect to status, a linear declination from a group raised through revelation to elect status, to a status-degraded group denied revelation and handed over to judgment. The intervening units work out incrementally the details of this startling contrast. Prominently

¹²⁵ The irruptiveness and nonsensical nature of 13:34-35 in its Q 13 location, demonstrated in the preceding chapter, taken together with the ease with which it aligns itself with the proposed arrangement of the Controversy Discourse, ensures that we are on firm ground in taking the Matthean location of 13:34-35 for the original Q sequence. The argument here is not circular. Literary structures created through lexical, semantic, and form-recurrence can act as an *additional* indicator of the original Q sequence. Heil, “Reception of Q in Luke,” 3, states that “the rhetorical strategy of the final redaction of Q may be a criterion in the search for Q’s original order.” Robert Funk states, “Rhetorical structure can function as an index to compositional integrity and as a clue to intrusive elements” (“Unravelling the Jesus Tradition,” 33). Ron Cameron, “What have you come out to see?” Characterizations of John and Jesus in the Gospels,” in *The Apocryphal Jesus and Christian Origins = Semeia* 49, ed. Ron Cameron (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 35-69, esp. 37, uses structural arguments to place Q 16:16 in its Lukan location.

¹²⁶ Compare the “mustard seed” framework formed by 13:18-19 and 17:5-6; also the opening and closing references to judgment (12:2-12; 22:30b).

¹²⁷ Achtemeier, “*Omne Verbum Sonat*,” 24-26.

¹²⁸ In the *Golden Verses*, the same contrast between those who see and those

within this sequence is found a version of the common saying, "The last state is worse than the first," which climaxes the middle unit of the macro composition (11:24-26). A virtual double of the central saying of the Eschatological Discourse ("The last shall be first and the first shall be last" [13:30]), this saying epitomizes the decline in status depicted in the course of the Controversy Discourse.

Kloppenborg points out that the reference to "Jerusalem" and its "house" in 13:34-35 invokes the official Temple cult and the hierarchy of purity and status integral thereto, with the verses declaring the cultic system to be invalid by pronouncing the οἶκος abandoned.¹²⁹ The Jerusalem temple, like all temples, constituted the axis of earth and heaven, the sacred nexus of God and humanity from which everything profane and unclean was scrupulously excluded; correspondingly, it was the place of divine revelation.¹³⁰ The declaration that the holy precincts are abandoned is striking enough but takes on increased significance when seen in the light of the other framework unit (10:23-24), where Jesus presents himself as embodying fresh revelation to an elect group

who do not occurs in linear juxtaposition: lines 45-49 invoke Pythagoras as the revealer (compare Q 10:21-22), followed by the promise to his followers of coming "to know the essence of the immortal gods and mortal men...you will come to know...you will come to know" (lines 50-52). To this is juxtaposed references to those who lack this revelation (lines 53-60), those "who do not see (ἐσορῶσιν) the good though it is near, nor do they hear it" (lines 54-55).

¹²⁹ Kloppenborg, "City and Wasteland," 155-56; see also Horsley, "Questions about Redactional Strata," 198, idem, "Q and Jesus," 195-96, 202, idem, *Sociology and the Jesus Movement* (New York: Crossroad, 1989) 132, and idem, "Social Conflict," 52. There is some debate over whether οἶκος refers to the Temple or to Jerusalem as a whole. The issue is moot because Jerusalem and Temple—holy city and sacred precincts—were inseparable. See Catchpole, "Tradition and Temple," 256, who cites 2 Macc 5:15-20, David E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23*, NovTSuppl 52 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 198-99, and Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 117.

¹³⁰ David M. Knipe, "The Temple in Image and Reality," in *Temple in Society*, ed. Michael V. Fox (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988), 105-38, esp. 110-12, 118, 124; Jacob Neusner, *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*, SJLA 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 115; Perdue, *Cult*, 9; Johann Maier, "Self-Definition, Prestige, and Status of Priests Towards the End of the Second Temple Period," *BTB* 23 (1993) 139-50, esp. 147; Robert L. Cohn, *The Shape of Sacred Space. Four Biblical Studies*, AARSR 23 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), 69. See Gen 28:10-22; Exod 33:7-11; 39:32; 40:2, 6, 29; 1 Sam 3:2-14; Isa 6:1-13; Sir 24; Luke 1:8-23; Josephus, *War*, 6.300; *Antiq* 20.166.

of followers.¹³¹ For Q Jesus constitutes the new axis between earth and heaven. At the same time the official cult is portrayed as no longer functional but rather under judgment.¹³² The ironic benediction in 13:35 is in fact a malediction, perhaps intended to parody the priestly blessing routinely pronounced in the Temple courts after the sacrifice of the daily whole offering.¹³³ The *raison d'être* of the Temple, the presence, revelation, and blessing of God, has come in the person of the revealer-figure to dwell amidst the Q group. The immediately following instruction on prayer (11:2-13) depicts the group engaged in the fundamental cultic activity of prayer and hence in intimate communion with the Deity.¹³⁴ In contrast, the divine presence has left Jerusalem and the Temple, now declared to be abandoned.¹³⁵ Zeller argues that the language of 13:34-35, particularly the declaration, "You will no longer see me," conventionally refers to the disappear-

¹³¹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 197-98; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.122; Schenk, *Synopse*, 59; Polag, *Christologie*, 162. To be sure, this depiction of Jesus as the Revelator begins in 10:21-22. However, we shall see below that 10:21-22 concludes the Mission Instruction. Q 10:21-22 and 10:23-24, the end of the second and the beginning of the third section of Q respectively, by definition form the center of Q. As in the *Golden Verses*, the center profiles the Revealer-figure.

¹³² Kloppenborg, "City and Wasteland," 156.

¹³³ On the priestly benediction see S. Safrai, "The Temple," in *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, Vol. 2, CRINT, edited by S. Safrai et al. (Amsterdam & Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976), 865-907, esp. 877, 889, 905, E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992), 16, and Cohn, *Sacred Space*, 69.

¹³⁴ Some scholars argue that 10:23-24 intrudes between 10:21-22 and 11:2-13, feeling that Jesus' prayer instruction should follow immediately upon his own prayer (Zeller, *Kommentar*, 56; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.124). Others argue that the blessing in 10:23-24 prepares for the instruction on prayer (Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 94; Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 190). A structural analysis helps resolve differences of opinion derived from thematic considerations which, taken alone, frequently point in more than one direction.

¹³⁵ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 357; Zeller, "Entrückung," 518-19 ("Entfernung der Gegenwart Gottes"); Hoffmann, *Studien*, 174-75; Horn, "Christentum und Judentum," 361. The departure of the deities Trust, Wisdom (Sophrosyne), and the Graces from the unrighteous city is announced in *Theognis* 1138 (see Lowell Edmunds, "The Genre of Theognidean Poetry," in *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, eds. Thomas J. Figueira and Gregory Nagy [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985], 96-111, esp. 102). In Hesiod, *Works and Days*, Shame, Nemesis, and Dike abandon the unrighteous cities, an abandonment followed by Zeus's judgment (196-200, 220-224, 256-262).

ance of revealer-figures at the time of their rapture to heaven, an event which signifies doom for those left behind.¹³⁶ Thus on the one hand the revealer mediates the revelation of God to the elect group while on the other there occurs a removal to heaven from the sacred precincts on earth followed in turn by a return from heaven to earth in judgment. This emphasis upon the heaven-earth nexus in the framework units provides the cosmic setting for the criticism of purity and cult praxis which will occur in the main body of the discourse.

The other form-critical and motif inversions between the framework units are closely related to this fundamental contrast. Both units contain a macarism; however, the first blessing announces "die angebrochene Heilzeit" (10:23-24)¹³⁷ whereas the second is, as noted, a malediction announcing judgment (13:34-35).¹³⁸ The placement of the macarism of 13:35b within the announcement of judgment renders it Sophia's ironic vaticination of a "coming" in judgment, probably of the Son of Man, in turn depicted graphically in the adjoining Eschatological Discourse (12:2-22:30).¹³⁹ Two "comings" are thus contrasted in the framework units: 10:23-24 announces the presence of a joyous revelation long anticipated by prophets and kings,¹⁴⁰ whereas 13:34-35 announces a "coming" in judgment.

The Prayer instruction (11:2-13) and the Woes (11:39-52) are adjacent to the respective framework units. The long, variegated passage 11:39-48, 52, 49-51 has supplied much grist for the mills of redaction-history, "expansion from kernels" analyses.¹⁴¹ How-

¹³⁶ Zeller, "Entrückung," 515-19, noting such figures as Enoch, Baruch, Sophia. See also Schenk, *Synopse*, 81.

¹³⁷ Sato, *Prophetie*, 37, 261, citing *Ps. Sol.* 18:6; 17:44; *Sib.* III, 371; IV, 192; *4 Esr.* 6:25; 9:7f; *Syr. Bar.* 44:7, 11; see also Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.120.

¹³⁸ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 352; Sato, *Prophetie*, 157-58; Polag, *Christologie*, 93; Zeller, *Kommentar*, 86; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 360; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 229, note 234.

¹³⁹ Schürmann, "Wider dieses Geschlecht," 74; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 178; Sato, *Prophetie*, 157; von Lips, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 275, 278; Zeller, *Kommentar*, 86; Polag, *Christologie*, 94; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 359; James M. Robinson, "Jesus as Sophos and Sophia: Wisdom Tradition and the Gospels," in *Aspects of Wisdom*, 1-16, esp. 13.

¹⁴⁰ Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 190; Schenk, *Synopse*, 59.

¹⁴¹ For redaction-history and redaction-history analyses see Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 45-47, Schürmann, "Wider 'dieses Geschlecht,'" passim, idem, "Zeugnis," 174-75, idem, *Lukasevangelium* 2.317-18, 321, 327, 332-33, Kloppenborg, *Forma-*

ever, in their present configuration these verses constitute a coherent, unified composition. From the form-critical perspective this section *taken in its entirety* is a fine specimen of the prophetic announcement of judgment genre, which consists of two sections: (1) the accusation (*Anklage*), followed by (2) the announcement of judgment itself. Social and economic transgressions frequently are the focus of prophetic accusations. Though styles vary, a series of self-contained woes listing specific sins can function as the accusation when connected to the announcement; the woe form itself is predicated upon anticipation of disaster. The actual announcement of judgment is usually though not always introduced by some variation on the messenger formula, "Therefore, thus says the Lord..." upon which follows announcement of some future divine sanction (using future tense verbs), usually correlated with some of the transgressions listed in the accusation and frequently expressed in general terms as compared with the specificity of the accusation. The announcement focuses upon God's intervention and its consequences.¹⁴²

Q 11:39-48, 52, 49-51 conforms in critical respects to the announcement of judgment genre: accusation in serialized woes (11:39-48, 52) + messenger formula (11:49a) + announcement of judgment (11:49b-51).¹⁴³ The emergence of the contours of this prophetic genre in all three of its components shows that regardless of the tradition-histories of its constituent parts, the entire passage in its present form came into existence as the result of a single editorial initiative, and hence 11:49-51 is not, as Klop-

tion, 140-44; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 119-27; Sato, *Prophetie*, 152, 156; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 176-77; and Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 61-62, 94.

¹⁴² Westermann, *Basic Forms*, 55, 70, 86-87, 97, 100, 121, 130-32, 149, 169-71, 190-93; Ludwig Markert, *Struktur und Bezeichnung des Scheltwort. Eine gattungskritische Studie anhand des Amosbuches*, BZAW 140 (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1977), 226-27; Wolff, *Amos the Prophet*, 19, 30-31; Gene M. Tucker, "Prophetic Speech," *Int* 32 (1978) 31-45, esp. 38-43; Hardmeier, *Texttheorie*, 267, 275. See also Sato, *Prophetie*, 185, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 143-44; idem, "Social History," 92.

¹⁴³ The difference between the prophetic messenger formula, *τάδε λέγει ὁ κύριος*, and Q's *διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία..εἶπεν* is not great enough to support Kloppenborg's claim that "Q 11:49-51 is not prefaced with the prophetic formula..." and, accordingly, denial of the presence here of a prophetic genre ("Social History," 92), particularly since in *Formation*, 144, Kloppenborg notes that either *τάδε* or *διὰ τοῦτο* can introduce the messenger formula.

penborg argues, an interpolation into the serialized woes.¹⁴⁴ Moreover, it corroborates the view that the position of the woe in Luke 11:52 *after* the announcement of judgment is anomalous and hence due to a Lukan transposition and not, accordingly, due to 11:49-51 being interpolated.¹⁴⁵ The appearance of "the Wisdom of God" in the place normally assigned to Yahweh in the messenger formula (11:49a: διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία..εἶπεν) is not anomalous, for Q has already designated Jesus Wisdom's envoy (7:31-35), and that Jesus should presume to relay her words here is consistent with the genre, in which the prophet speaks for Yahweh.¹⁴⁶ Wisdom standing in for Yahweh is attested in *Wis* 10-11, a passage which also explains why the rejection of Wisdom's envoys ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in Q 11:50 is specified in 11:51a as beginning ἀπὸ αἵματος "Αβελ, for *Wis* 10:3 connects Cain's murder of Abel with his rejection of Wisdom, thus marking the murder of Abel as the first instance of the rejection of Wisdom.

Q 11:39-48, 52, 49-51, viewed in its entirety, displays a conventional collocation of motifs. "Between the altar and the house" is a circumlocution for "Temple," actually, the Court of the Priests, and the murderous shedding of righteous blood in this

¹⁴⁴ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 144.

¹⁴⁵ Genre considerations support the judicious assessment of Ronald Jolliffe, "Database and Evaluation of Q 11:52," *Documenta Q*, 1-9, esp. 3-4, typescript, that 11:52 belongs (somewhere) among the serialized woes, with 11:49-51 constituting a climactic conclusion (attached in both Gospels to 11:48), as Matthew has it, even though the IQP mistakenly did not follow him in his opinion. When I refer to "11:39-48, 52, 49-51," I am simply expressing my judgment with regard to the Q shape of this passage: Woes + Announcement of Judgment, and am not opining on the placement of 11:52 relative to the other woes.

¹⁴⁶ Thus it is difficult to follow Kloppenborg in his opinion that "in the midst of woes attributed to Jesus it is unexpected to find a saying of Sophia speaking..." (*Formation*, 144). Kloppenborg's analysis does not distinguish clearly between the forms woe oracle and announcement of judgment. Kloppenborg problematizes—and resolves through his interpolation hypothesis—the fact that "the woes offer reproaches, the Sophia oracle is a threat of retribution on this generation," when in fact this represents the natural sequence of the announcement of judgment genre. However, Kloppenborg's statement, "...it appears that a saying of Sophia has been joined to a series of woes...to form a judgment oracle..." can be affirmed as an accurate description of the Q compositional initiative which brought traditions together to give 11:39-48, 52, 49-51 its form, though with the "interpolation" theory subtracted out.

court (11:51ab) may be intended as a black parody of the official sacrificial cult and its custodians, anticipating the parody of the priestly benediction in 13:35, a benediction which, as noted, routinely followed the sacrifice.¹⁴⁷ Temple and sacrificial cult were the hub of the entire redemptive and purity system with its rules and obligations derived from sacred text.¹⁴⁸ The same motif constellation as appears in 11:39-48, 52, 49-51— injustice, greed, oppression of the poor, commandments, corpse impurity, tithes, cult, altar, murder, sacrifice, and divine retribution—occurs in *Sir* 34:21-35:20, a section devoted to cult.¹⁴⁹ Temple service and scribal activities appear side by side under the purview of the Revelatrice “Wisdom” in *Sir* 24.¹⁵⁰ Thus from both socio-cultural and topoi perspectives there is little justification for driving a redaction-history wedge between 11:49-51, which pointedly makes reference to the Temple and cultic space, and the Woes in 11:39-48, 52, most elements of which refer to the purity system (tradition-history heterogeneity is another matter). The woes which precede the Temple parody burlesque a range of these purity rules and accuse the socio-religious elites who propagate them of injustice, oppression, and ritual impurity, a critique which cli-

¹⁴⁷ With regard to this space being the preserve of the priests see Menahem Haran, “Temple and Community in Ancient Israel,” in *Temple and Society*, 17-26, esp. 20-21, Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 62, Safrai, “Temple,” 867-70, and Maier, “Status of Priests,” 146. “Between the altar and the sanctuary” thus metonymically invokes “priests” as surely as “10 Downing Street” refers to the British Prime Minister, “the White House” the American President, and “Queen’s Park” the Ontario government.

¹⁴⁸ Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, *Calling Jesus Names. The Social Value of Labels in Matthew* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988), 80; Sheldon R. Isenberg, “Power Through Temple and Torah in Greco-Roman Palestine,” in *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, vol. 2, *Early Christianity*, ed. Jacob Neusner, SJLA 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 24-52, esp. 27-28, 31-32; Neusner, *Idea of Purity*, 22; Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger. An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), 41, 57; Martin Goodman, *The Ruling Class of Judaea. The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome A. D. 66-70* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 106.

¹⁴⁹ See Perdue, *Cult*, 198-99, who also notes a connection made between justice and cult praxis in *Merikare*, *Amenemopet*, and *Papyrus Insinger* (see pages 46, 54-55, 62). Criticism of official cult and the elites who control it is also a stock feature of the prophetic books. See Paul R. Noble, “The Literary Structure of Amos: A Thematic Analysis,” *JBL* 114 (1995) 209-26, esp. 211; also Isa 58, Jer 7, and the book of Malachi.

¹⁵⁰ Perdue, *Cult*, 190.

maxes with an announcement of judgment depicting a polluting sacrifice in the heart of the sacred precincts.¹⁵¹ In Q the logical consequence of this abominable pollution is set forth in 13:34-35: a divine presence departs from Temple and Holy City. Similarly, in rebuking the Athenians for bloody festivals in which criminals were set to slaughter one another, Apollonius of Tyana “was surprised ‘that the goddess had not already quitted the Acropolis, when you shed such blood under her eyes...’” (*Life*, 4.22).

From the perspective of genre and topos analysis, therefore, Q 11:39-48, 52, 49-51 is a self-contained literary unit devoted to a critique of the official cult, its custodians, and the praxis and practitioners of purity rules indissolubly connected to the sacred center. We have already noted the elaborative connection of this unit with 13:34-35, the immediately adjoining and concluding framework unit. The question now arises as to what kind of compositional relationship it might have with the Prayer Instruction (11:2-13), which in a similar manner stands adjacent to the opening framework unit (10:23-24).

Form-critically, the Prayer instruction and the woes + announcement of judgment are quite different. Moreover, lexical links between them are weak at best. The Prayer Instruction, in fact, prepares for the Woes in just two respects, but these are highly suggestive. The first is their mutual exploitation of the image of a door (11:9-10; 52), represented by cognate words such as “knock,” “open,” “key,” “lock,” “enter.” What is at stake in both units, indeed, in this entire discourse, is *access* to God—obstructed or barred access in the case of the official cult and its purity apparatus; open access in the case of the prayer instruction. It goes without saying that prayer is a cultic activity. In fact, the Sirach passage on cult noted above (34:21-35:20) itself overlaps

¹⁵¹ With regard to defilement of the Temple and priestly personnel see Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 51 and Neusner, *Idea of Purity*, 39-40: invoking a misdeed which occurred within Temple precincts was a stock method of referring to the profanation of the Temple itself (2 *Macc* 5:16, 6:3-6; *Ps. Sol.* 1:8, 2:3, 13, 8:13; *Ass. Mos.* 5:3, *Ant.* 20:166-67; see also Kloppenborg, “City and Wasteland,” 156). Noting the coherent rhetorical effect of the contiguous arrangement of all or part of 11:39-48, 52, 49-51 are Sato, *Prophetic*, 196, Horsley, “Q and Jesus,” 192, Schürmann, “Wider ‘dieses Geschlecht,’” 54; Vaage, *Upstarts*, 117, and Tuckett, “Mark and Q,” 158.

with a discussion of prayer which emphasizes the certainty that God hears the supplications of the oppressed (35:16-26).¹⁵² The second connection is similarly antithetical, signaled through words in the semantic fields of *purity* and *pollution*: ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου (11:2) versus καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν...τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν γέμει ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας (11:39b), μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα (11:44, to which can be added the defiling blood of the prophet murdered in the Temple, referred to in 11:51).¹⁵³ Q 11:2-13 in effect marks out a *temenos* of pure space in which the deity is present, sanctified, and petitioned.¹⁵⁴ Its early appearance in discourse sets up a highly unfavorable comparison of this sacred space with the official cult and its apparatus centered in Jerusalem, to be denounced and delegitimized later in the discourse.¹⁵⁵

The comparison extends beyond opposition of sacred spaces and sets up an extensive contrast embracing a range of socio-cultural indicators. The woes and announcement of judgment give a comprehensive description of an exploitive political, social, and economic system based in the twin institutions of city and temple. Though Matthew and Luke differ in the precise label assigned to those targeted by the woes, their social, cultural, and religious roles are easily read from the social functions the accusations assign to them.¹⁵⁶ Their social location is that of the elite

¹⁵² A contrast between temple and prayer is recorded in Lucian, *Demonax*, trans. A. M. Harmon, LCL, 27.

¹⁵³ See Jerome H. Neyrey, 2 *Peter, Jude*, AB 37C (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 11-12, for a discussion of semantic domains dealing with purity and pollution.

¹⁵⁴ The Temple was the place where God's name dwelt; see 2 Kings 8:16-21, 29; 1 *Esdras* 4:62-63.

¹⁵⁵ Compare Mal 1:6-11 and Jer 7.

¹⁵⁶ Horsely, "Q and Jesus," 192; idem, "Social Conflict," 53; Malina and Neyrey, *Calling*, 58. Pharisees, scribes and priests were not co-terminus groups, though overlap existed; early Pharisaic material is focused in a supportive manner upon temple issues (Sanders, *Practice & Belief*, 26, 177-181, 435). Many priests would have been scribes. Noting the overlap of the labels "scribes" and "Pharisees" as regards social function is Michael Ebertz, *Das Charisma des Gekreuzigten. Zur Soziologie der Jesusbewegung*, WUNT 45 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1987), 216. Sanders notes the involvement of Pharisees in government (386, 403-405, 412). The generative Q text should be minimally represented, roughly, as "Woe to you, Pharisees and x..." since both Matthew and Luke invoke, in some manner or other, two designations. Analysis of social-location indicators provides an alternative route to resolution of the problem of the groups in view here.

of a temple city. As Douglas Oakman puts it, "The powerful control the Temple and are the primary beneficiaries of it."¹⁵⁷ The pointed reference of 11:51 to unseemly actions in the Court of the Priests supports the notion that the priestly establishment is at least partly in view. The claim in 11:43 to positions of honor in public assemblies (perhaps also juridical positions) and respectful public greetings shows the location of members of this group as elites atop a hierarchical system based on prestige and ostentatious display of status-differences.¹⁵⁸ The fact that this group builds the graves of the prophets (11:47-48) is an indicator of its surplus wealth, urban orientation, desire for honor, and high position in the social hierarchy, for erection and maintenance of public monuments was a customary, honor-augmenting activity of urban ruling elites in the Hellenistic and Roman world.¹⁵⁹ Their mode of gaining surplus wealth is indicated by 11:42, 39b, which mentions in tight combination scrupulousness with tithes, neglect of justice, and rapacity.¹⁶⁰ Tithes were a form

¹⁵⁷ Douglas E. Oakman, "The Herodian Temple and the Jesus Tradition: An Essay in Conceptual Modelling," (unpublished paper, 1990), 3.

¹⁵⁸ Anthony J. Saldarini, "Delegitimation of Leaders in Matthew 23," *CBQ* 54 (1992) 659-80, esp. 671; Ramsay MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations*. 50 B. C. to A. D. 284 (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1974), 39-40, 59, 107-10; Halvor Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts," in *Social World of Luke-Acts*, 241-68, esp. 256; idem, "The Social Context of Luke's Community," *Int* 48 (1994) 379-89, esp. 382; Ebertz, *Charisma*, 234-45; Haran, "Temple and Community," 19; Gideon Sjöberg, *The Preindustrial City: Past and Present* (New York: Free Press; London: Collier-Macmillan, 1965), 125-26, 130-32; Malina and Neyrey, *Calling*, 72. Temple, as the place both of cult and cultivation of sacred texts, requires a hereditary priesthood and educated scribal class; hence it inevitably involves a hierarchalized social structure. See Gary M. Feinman, "Mesoamerican Temples," in *Temple in Society*, 67-82, esp. 73, Safrai, "Temple," 872, and Knipe, "Temple," 121-23.

¹⁵⁹ A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City From Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940), 170, 179-80, 236-37, 247-50; MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations*, 61-62; Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 55, 129; idem, "The First Jewish Revolt: Social Conflict and the Problem of Debt," *JJS* 33 (1982) 417-27, esp. 420; Sjöberg, *City*, 125; Kloppenborg, "Alms, Debt, and Divorce," 190. Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society. A Sociological Approach* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988), 25-26, referring to Jonathan Turner, *Societal Stratification: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia, 1984), 59-60, lists prestige as one of three "valued resources," the unequal distribution of which constitutes social stratification, the other two being material wealth and power.

¹⁶⁰ See Shimon Appelbaum, "Economic Life in Palestine," in *Jewish People in the First Century* 2.631-700, esp. 692, citing *T. Menahoth* 13:22.

of direct expropriation of the agricultural production of the rural poor, and in combination with Herodian and Roman taxation contributed to rural dwellers' impoverishment, social fragmentation, hunger, indebtedness, and resultant alienation from traditional land-holdings.¹⁶¹ Amos 5:11 levels this accusation against the urban elites: "You trample on the poor and take from them levies of grain, you have built houses of hewn stone...." In 5:21-22 this turns into a denunciation of pious cultic practice in the setting of systemic injustice and oppression of the poor. Tithes as taxation also contributed to an unequal system of redistribution whereby agricultural production was drained to the city (in the case of tithes, via the Temple), where it contributed to the wealth of the urban elite groups (priestly families, elders, scribes, Herodians) and to furthering their interests.¹⁶² Walter Burkert describes the ancient temple as the "monument into which the available surplus of society is transformed...."¹⁶³ The accusation that members of this group "load people with burdens hard to bear" is obscure, but may refer to the scholarly interpretation of Torah and correlative power of legal decisions which are the

¹⁶¹ Horsley, "Redactional Strata," 199; idem, "Social Conflict," 54; idem, *Sociology*, 135; idem, "Q and Jesus," 192; John H. Elliot, "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions," in *Social World of Luke-Acts*, 211-40, esp. 235; Ebertz, *Charisma*, 156-58; Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 56-68; Sjöberg, *City*, 120.

¹⁶² Douglas E. Oakman, *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day*, Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 8 (Lewiston, Queenston: Edwin Mellen, 1986), 78, 156, 211; idem, "The Countryside in Luke-Acts," in *Social World of Luke-Acts*, 151-79, esp. 156; idem, "Herodian Temple," 3-5; Horsley, *Sociology*, 34, 68-69, 73-75; Elliot, "Temple versus Household," 220-21, 235; Sjöberg, *Preindustrial City*, 115, 118-19; Maier, "Status of Priests," 145; Appelbaum, "Economic Life," 664, 679, 683; Goodman, "Debt," 420; Sanders, *Practice & Belief*, 83. Sanders' questioning of the scholarly tendency to construe the Jerusalem aristocracy onesidedly as cynical bandits is a useful corrective; however, Sanders' work lacks significant engagement with the increasing number of social-anthropological studies of ancient agrarian societies or studies of social relations characteristic of those societies; standard works (such as MacMullen's) are absent from his bibliography, making it difficult for Sanders to achieve critical distance from the paternalistic aristocratic ideology of his sources. Sanders argues that tithes and tributes were not so onerous—perhaps less than 30 per cent (167) but anyone who has lived at subsistence knows the devastating impact of even small exactions; see George M. Foster, "Peasant Society and the Image of the Limited Good," *AmAnth* 67 (1965) 293-315, esp. 296, 307.

¹⁶³ Walter Burkert, "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece," in *Temple and Society*, 27-47, esp. 43.

prerogative of certain members of the educated elite, activities which legitimate and mystify the way society is organized, generate tithing rules, and mandate an obligation to obedience which may be economically onerous for the poor.¹⁶⁴ That members of this group filled this role is suggested by their concern to work out rules of purity (11:39b, 40, 42). The study of sacred script necessary for working out specific applications of purity marks this group as educated, another indicator of elite status in the ancient world.¹⁶⁵ Accordingly, they are custodians of another of the redemptive media, sacred text.¹⁶⁶ The custodial connectedness of this group with Temple and sacred text explains why Q 11:52 can accuse it of failure to fulfill its obligation to broker access to God; ironically, they obstruct access to God instead of facilitating it.¹⁶⁷

The unsurpassed sacrality of the Temple and its rootedness in Israel's sacred history rendered it a cultural symbol with enormous capacity to mystify unequal social relations connecting city to countryside.¹⁶⁸ Conversely, "the more sacred an institution,

¹⁶⁴ See Kloppenborg, "Social History," 98, Rohrbaugh, "Pre-industrial City," 133-34, Horsley, *Sociology*, 90, 135, idem, "Q and Jesus," 193, Oakman, "Countryside," 157, Sjöberg, *City*, 119, 227, 230, 256-57, and Ebertz, *Charisma*, 172.

¹⁶⁵ Ebertz, *Charisma*, 217; Sjöberg, *City*, 125, 227-28; Achtemeier, "Omne Verbum Sonat," 15; Sanders, *Practice & Belief*, 386. Temple and school, worship and education, and hence priestly and scribal functions were frequently combined or at least juxtaposed in ancient societies, and are still today in temple-based cultures. See Perdue, *Cult*, 54-55, 93, Feinman, "Temples," 74, Knipe, "Temple," 124-26, Sjöberg, *City*, 119, 258, Maier, "Status of Priests," 148, and André Lemaire, "The Sage in School and Temple," in *The Sage In Israel and the Ancient Near East*, eds. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 165-81, esp. 177-80 (noting the location of the scribe Baruch in the Temple in Jer 36:10). Perdue, *Cult*, 189-90, suggests that Sirach was a member of the "scribes of the Temple" (Josephus *Ant.* XII.138f.) and notes that *Amenemopet* is addressed to "a young priestly scribe functioning within the Temple of Min..." (55).

¹⁶⁶ Isenberg, "Temple and Torah," 34; Maier, "Status of Priests," 148; Safrai, "Temple," 865-67, 905; Sanders, *Practice & Belief*, 171-81.

¹⁶⁷ Halvor Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations," 255-56, notes that the scribes and Pharisees functioned as religious brokers, for "access to God was granted through Temple and Torah." See also Ebertz, *Charisma*, 228-29. Sir 24 combines Temple and Torah within one speech as the places of Wisdom's repose (Perdue, *Cult*, 190); Q 11's corresponding speech denies both assertions.

¹⁶⁸ John H. Elliot, "Household and Meals vs. Temple Purity Replication Patterns in Luke-Acts," *BTB* 21 (1991) 102-108, esp. 102; Safrai, "Temple," 906; Horsley, *Sociology*, 88; Oakman, "Countryside," 160; idem, "Herodian Temple," 5; Rohrbaugh, "Pre-industrial City," 134; Sanders, *Practice & Belief*, 237.

the more stringent the criticism of its actually existing form often will be."¹⁶⁹ Thus it is appropriate that 11:39-48, 52, 49-51 should climax in an explicit reference to the sacred space of the Temple and aggressively challenge its claim to legitimacy by recalling a heinous murder of a prophet between the altar and the sanctuary carried out by political elites (11:51a; the murder of Abel likewise occurred in relation to a sacrifice).

The Prayer Instruction (11:2-13) paints a picture in every respect the antithesis of the above. The people of 11:2-13 are poor to the point of being threatened with hunger, for supply of daily bread is a recurring matter for prayer. They are probably village-based peasantry, for "the basic economic problem of all ancient village life...was the narrow margin between subsistence and famine.... Understandably, many peasants lived under constant anxiety over subsistence."¹⁷⁰ Garnsey and Woolf state, "The poor are those living at or near subsistence level, whose prime concern is to obtain the minimum food, shelter and clothing necessary to sustain life...."¹⁷¹ Over against this concern about a subsistence supply of bread, the group described in 11:39-42 is exercised about the purity of dishes and the tithing of herbs. In contrast to the surplus wealth of the group addressed in the woes, debt is a pressing issue for the people addressed by the prayer instruction.¹⁷² At the same time the instruction envisions the group as incarnating a renewed social order where forgiveness of debts is the order of the day.¹⁷³ The Temple was the nor-

On temples as symbols and legitimations of urban-based economic and political power see Peter Berger, *The Social Reality of Religion* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1973), 97, Knipe, "Temple," 132, Oakman, "Herodian Temple," 3-4, Burkert, "Meaning and Function," 39-40, 44, Winston Davis, "Temples and Shrines in Japan: Their Social Functions," in *Temple and Society*, 83-103, esp. 86, and Ebertz, *Charisma*, 129-30.

¹⁶⁹ Theißen, *Social Function*, 97.

¹⁷⁰ Oakman, "Countryside," 167; see also idem, "Herodian Temple," 4, Horsley, *Sociology*, 89, and Ebertz, *Charisma*, 154.

¹⁷¹ Peter Garnsey and Greg Woolf, "Patronage of the rural poor in the Roman world," in *Patronage in Ancient Society*, 153-70, esp. 153.

¹⁷² On peasant debt see MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations*, 15, 51-53, Applebaum, "Economic Life," 661-62, and Goodman, "Debt," 418-19, 424-26.

¹⁷³ Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 190; Elliot, "Household and Meals," 104; Kloppenborg, "Alms, Debt, and Divorce," 192-93; see also Gildas Hamel, *Poverty and Charity in Roman Palestine, First Three Centuries C.E.*, University of California Publications: Near Eastern Studies 23 (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 161.

mative and usual place "to alleviate these debts incurred to God."¹⁷⁴ Hence the supplication, ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, may indicate displacement of this function and a corresponding longing for atonement no longer assured by the official cult. Prayer itself could be viewed as a kind of offering.¹⁷⁵ Both illustrative units of the instruction, the Friend at Midnight and the Son's Request, depict a communitarian order, rooted in the nature of God, in which food and resources are shared as between friends or among members of a family.¹⁷⁶ Reciprocal friendship and kin relationships are in fact two of the three major survival strategies—means of securing access to scarce resources—characteristic of subsistence existence in peasant villages of agrarian societies (the third being cultivation of a patron).¹⁷⁷ This contrasts with the stratified, urban-based social system based upon differences in prestige and honor portrayed in 11:39-48, 52, 49-51 (*communitas* versus structure). In contrast to the institution of the Temple, which sits atop the exploitive, hierarchical social system condemned in the woes, Q chooses the institution of the *household* to embody its socio-religious ideals. In the household God presides as the beneficent father. Its members are friends and kin who share resources, forgive obligations, and enjoy equally right to access to the Father.¹⁷⁸ The household is a place of free,

¹⁷⁴ Douglas E. Oakman, "Cursing Fig Trees and Robbers' Dens: Pronouncement Stories within Social-Systemic Perspective. Mark 11:12-25 and Parallels," in *Rhetoric of Pronouncement*, 253-74, esp. 265.

¹⁷⁵ See Safrai, "Temple," 888, Sanders, *Practice & Belief*, 80, Oakman, "Fig Trees," 266, Haran, "Temple and Community," 22-23, and with regard to the function of prayer as a surrogate for sacrifice in the Qumran sect, see Sanders, *Practice & Belief*, 376-77, Craig A. Evans, "Opposition to the Temple: Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York, London: Doubleday, 1992), 235-53, esp. 247, Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge, London, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 14-15, and Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, trans. Jonathan Chipman, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 12 (Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1994), 14, 40, 47-48.

¹⁷⁶ Elliot, "Household and Meals," 102, 104; idem, "Temple and Household," 236.

¹⁷⁷ Garnsey & Woolf, "Patronage of Rural Poor," 154-55; Wolf, "Kinship, Friendship, and Patron-client Relations," 173; Scott, *Moral Economy*, 168; Richard A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity International Press, 1995), 200-205; Herzog, *Parables*, 200-208.

¹⁷⁸ Elliot, "Household and Meals," 103-104; idem, "Temple and Household," passim; Oakman, "Fig Trees," 266; Horsley, *Sociology*, 122-23.

unhindered access to God, as is expressed in the audaciously optimistic sayings of the instruction: "Ask, and it shall be given you, seek, and you shall find, knock, and it shall be opened to you" (11:9-10). Brokerage is supplied by Jesus, as is established by the preceding units, 10:21-22, 23-24. However, it is brokerage at the "periphery," that is, which bypasses (and competes with) the official brokerage and patronage at the "center."¹⁷⁹ This challenge by the periphery to the center sets the stage for the retaliatory "challenge and riposte" chreias (11:14-23; 11:29-35) which follow.¹⁸⁰

This dramatic displacement of sacred space carries on with a vengeance the aggressive rhetorical program set out in the framework units (10:23-24; 13:34-35), which on the one hand depict abandonment of the sacred precincts, on the other the awarding God's revelation to the Q group. The prayer instruction begins to unfold the meaning of the blessing of 10:23-24, setting forth as it does the privileged access to God and paternal care which is bestowed by Jesus' revelation.¹⁸¹ The sequential relationship of 11:39-48, 52, 49-51 with 13:34-35, has already been indicated—the divine presence withdraws from polluted sacred precincts.¹⁸² Moreover, the reference to the persecution and murder of prophets in 11:48-51 and 13:34 sets the stage for the instruction on courageous witness in 12:2-12.¹⁸³ At the same time the denial of sight set forth in 13:35 and the ominous promise of one "who comes in the name of the Lord" is immediately picked up by the maxim of 12:2, "Nothing is hidden which will

¹⁷⁹ Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations," 255-65; see also Ebertz, *Charisma*, 228-29, 249-50, Bruce J. Malina, "Patron and Client: The Analogy Behind Synoptic Theology," *Forum* 4/1 (1988) 2-32, esp. 10, and Isenberg, "Temple and Torah," 28. Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 295, and Kloppenborg, "Social History," 84, suggest that Q has in view "unmediated" access to God. While this certainly grasps the spirit of 11:2-13, it seems clear from the context of the prayer instruction that Jesus occupies the position of mediator.

¹⁸⁰ The contrasts in this discourse, particularly embodied in 11:2-13 and 11:39-48, 52, 49-51, can be expressed in other modes which limited space prohibits from developing here: (a) city versus country; (b) bad patronage by elites versus benevolent divine patronage; (c) *communitas*/liminality versus structure and status; (d) center versus periphery; (e) purity and pollution.

¹⁸¹ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.179.

¹⁸² See Newton, *Purity*, 6-7.

¹⁸³ Zeller, *Kommentar*, 72.

not be revealed," which in the course of the final discourse turns out to be the coming of the Son of Man.¹⁸⁴

Moving forward through the sequence from the Prayer Instruction, we come to 11:14-23, the Beelzebul Controversy, 11:24-26, the Return of the Unclean Spirit, and 11:29-35, the Request for a Sign. The Beelzebul and Request for a Sign clusters are both instructional speeches which, moreover, bear a strong resemblance to each other.¹⁸⁵ Κριταὶ ἔσονται (11:19b) and ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει...κατακρινεῖ (11:31, 32) establish a lexical connection. This lexical recurrence is far more than just casual, for judgment upon opponents is a major theme of the Controversy Discourse as a whole; hence it knits these units into the macro composition as well as to each other. Moreover, both phrases make the same point within their respective speeches: another party will judge those who adopt a hostile, or at best skeptical stance with respect to the divine activity visible in Jesus' ministry.¹⁸⁶ Both units invoke the presence of the kingdom in Jesus' ministry: if divine activity is recognized in the works of Jewish exorcists and in the wisdom and preaching of Solomon and Jonah, how much more should the presence of the Kingdom be visible in the ministry of Jesus (11:19b, 20; 11:31-32, 33).¹⁸⁷

Jesus' argument in both units centers around the fact that his interlocutors suffer from *faulty perception*. On the one hand they mistake the activities of the Kingdom for the works of Satan, while on the other "they request a sign from heaven, not perceiving that Jesus' preaching is itself the sign they request," which constitutes a "moral blindness, worthy of judgment and condemnation."¹⁸⁸ The fact that defects of perception and sight are raised in these units is significant from a macro compositional perspective, for the framework units (10:23-24; 13:34-35) profile precisely this motif—the gaining and loss of sight.¹⁸⁹ The blind-

¹⁸⁴ The two discourses are connected through "hook words," specifically, ἀποκτενοῦσιν ἀποκτείνουσα, ἀποκτείνοντων, ἀποκτεῖναι (11:49; 13:34, 12:4, 5), possibly συναγωγᾷς (11:43), συναγωγᾷς (12:11 Luke), and ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου (13:35), ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται (12:40).

¹⁸⁵ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 139.

¹⁸⁶ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 166; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 124-25.

¹⁸⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 124-25.

¹⁸⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 138.

¹⁸⁹ Schenk, *Synopse*, 74, notes the motif connection of 11:33-35 with 10:23.

ness of Jesus' challengers in the Beelzebul and Sign controversies is the blindness of a perverse unbelief.¹⁹⁰ This in turn generates the sanction announced in 13:35 whereby sight is denied until the unwelcome sight of judgment appears.

A motif contrast also links the Beelzebul with the Sign controversy. The opposition between Beelzebul (11:14-20) and ἀπλότης, "singlemindedness" (11:34), is a semantic configuration with conventional status in Jewish paraenesis. Garrett cites occurrences of the contrast in *T. Iss.* 6:1; 7:7; *T. Ben.* 6:7; 2 ("Beliar"); 2 Cor 11:3; *T. Job* 26:7-8, and states, "First-century Jewish and Christian readers would have readily understood the description of Beliar as 'double-minded' or 'duplicitous'."¹⁹¹ The occurrence of this thematic pair, the one, Beelzebul, cited at the beginning of the first instruction, and the other, the virtue of single-mindedness, cited near the end of the second, forms a kind of inclusio, based on this conventional antithesis, between 11:14-23 and 11:29-35. It also constitutes a deadly rhetorical counter-thrust: the opponents try to delegitimize Jesus by associating him with Beelzebul (11:14-15); by denying to his opponents the virtue of ἀπλότης, (11:34), Jesus turns tables.

Appropriately, therefore, both 11:14-23 and 11:29-35 are "challenge and riposte" chreias in which Jesus repulses and counters agents of censure who challenge his legitimacy and attempt to label him a deviant.¹⁹² Jesus' healing of the demon-possessed man marks him as a broker who claims "to give access to the power of God," but in a manner which "bypasses the traditional urban and legal central power of temple and Torah by proclaiming the immediacy of the kingdom of God [see 11:20] and performing miracles of healing."¹⁹³ Jesus' acts of power on the "periphery" challenge the monopoly of power held by those at the "center," namely, the elites based in Jerusalem and the Temple. Consequently, they try to censure his ministry and delegitimize him.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 138.

¹⁹¹ Garrett, "Light in You," 99-100.

¹⁹² See Bruce M. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 97-99, 351-54.

¹⁹³ Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations," 265. See also Hollenbach, "Jesus, Demoniacs, and Public Authorities," 583-84.

¹⁹⁴ Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations," 258. See Edward Shils, "Center and Periphery," in *Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1975), 3-16.

They challenge Jesus' claim to give access to God's power by negatively relabelling him a deviant in league with the devil. Similarly, their demand for a sign is an attempt to cast doubt on the legitimacy of Jesus' activities by suggesting that it is not God who empowers his activities.¹⁹⁵ Both challenges are initiatives taken by agents of censure to maintain control of the means of access to God.¹⁹⁶ Given the confrontative duress of the setting, it is fitting that the literary form of these encounters should be that of a challenge and riposte chreia. "Challenge and riposte" describes a contest of honor in which a person through a challenge seeks to degrade the status of another (shame), and in which the person challenged defends himself or herself through a counter-challenge to the honor and status of the one who mounted the attack.¹⁹⁷ Jesus repels the attempt to shame him with the deviancy label (witchcraft) by counter-asserting his own definition of his activities as being a manifestation of the Kingdom of God. In the Demand for a Sign pericope he then counter-labels and shames his opponents by questioning the soundness of their faculty of moral perception and depicting them as deserving of judgment. At the end of these two controversies Jesus has

¹⁹⁵ Malina and Neyrey, *Calling*, 4, 30-31, 62; Manson, *Sayings*, 85; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 179.

¹⁹⁶ The conceptual apparatus used here comes from Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, "Conflict in Luke-Acts: Labelling and Deviance Theory," in *Social World of Luke-Acts*, 97-122. Malina and Neyrey state that deviance-labelling is an act of "social aggression" by those whose interests are tied to the social system as it currently exists against a person or persons whose activities are perceived as threatening those interests (100). Those who try to carry out this negative redefinition are "agents of censure," guardians of a socio-cultural-religious code configured to serve their interests (102). Malina and Neyrey note that in Jesus' society, agents of censure are the "Jerusalem elites" and the "local Roman government" (104; similarly Hollenbach, "Public Authorities," 577, Saldarini, "Delegitimation," 667-68, and Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 169). M. G. Marwick, "The Sociology of Sorcery in a Central African Tribe," in *Magic, Witchcraft and Curing*, ed. John Middleton (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1967), 101-26, esp. 125, argues that witchcraft accusations typically appear in situations in which there is competition and conflict over leadership in society and settled means for settling questions of legitimacy are lacking; see also Malina and Neyrey, *Calling*, 4, 28, 30-31, 37, 42, 48, 52-53, 57, 78.

¹⁹⁷ Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World," in *Social World*, 25-65, esp. 28-31. Malina and Neyrey define 11:14-23 as a "negative Honor Challenge" (49).

turned the tables on his challengers and augmented his honor at their expense.¹⁹⁸ This attack on the prestige and legitimacy of his opponents continues in a linear, escalating manner into 11:39-48, 52, 49-51, verses which counter-stigmatize them as being impure murderers of prophets.¹⁹⁹

Both 11:14-23 and 11:29-35 fit well into the macro composition. In the Beelzebul and Request for a Sign controversies, people who in all likelihood are members of the Jerusalem elites described in 11:39-48, 52, 49-51 attempt to censure and delegitimize Jesus at precisely the point where his claim to brokerage—and threat to their interests—is publicly demonstrated in the healing of a physically and spiritually afflicted man.²⁰⁰ The mute, demonized man healed in 11:14 is the sort of low-status, low-honor person for whom Jesus might act as broker and who might as a result find his way into the group addressed in the Prayer instruction (11:2-13). The woes elaborate on the meaning of Jesus' counter-label for his challengers, "evil generation" (11:29), and translate the inner darkness that Jesus imputes to his opponents (11:34-35) into an explicit description of moral corruption.²⁰¹

The Return of the Unclean Spirit and its concluding gnomic saying, "The last state of that person becomes worse than the first," have often been viewed as an appendage to 11:14-23 (usually taken as a warning of the consequences which follow upon failure to obey the admonition to commitment in 11:23).²⁰²

¹⁹⁸ Malina and Neyrey, *Calling*, 63-65, 76.

¹⁹⁹ Ebertz, *Charisma*, 233-34.

²⁰⁰ Malina and Neyrey, *Calling*, 44. The same sequence of events is attested in Acts 5:12-18: healings and exorcisms (5:12-16) + challenge from Temple authorities (5:17-18; see also Acts 3:1-10 + 4:1-12).

²⁰¹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 139; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 174, 182; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 183; Garrett, "Light in You," 103. In this respect τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν (11:35) and τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν γέμει ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας (11:39) might function as hook words.

²⁰² Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 144-45; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 127; Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 128; idem, *Kommentar*, 61-62; Piper, *Wisdom*, 124; Williams, "Parable and Chreia," 102; see also Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.250, ("Nachwort"), and Kilgallen, "Return of the Unclean Spirit," 56-57. Incidentally, the elaborative connection of 11:24-26 to 11:14-23 supports the inclusion of the Parable of the Strong Man (verses 21-22) in the speech, which in both versions assumes a house setting and a conflict over occupancy. The Return of the Unclean Spirit then takes up these motifs.

Unquestionably 11:24-26 stands in some such elaborate connection to the preceding speech. However, the fact that it is a discrete literary unit with its own gnomic conclusion suggests that its role in the composition might be more autonomous and hence more far-reaching than previously estimated. In fact, the fable/saying combination functions in a coordinating manner within the discourse and hence supplies a crucial link in the forward movement of its counter-labelling onslaught. We have already noted that the gnomic saying which drives home the point of the fable is a change of status saying. Like the central saying of the Eschatological Discourse, it accentuates the unfavorable contrast in status between the groups profiled in the framework units (10:23-24; 13:34-35), though its direct reference is to the second group. Since the loss of sight thematized by the Controversy Discourse is a defect of a human bodily faculty, it is appropriate that fable and saying describe the worsening state of a human being.²⁰³ The depiction of the demonized man of the fable is retrospective commentary upon 11:14-23, while at the same time it escalates, or better, initiates Jesus' counter-labeling of his opponents continuing through to and climaxing in the announcement of judgment at the end of the discourse. The images of 11:24-26 are taken up in 11:29-35, which similarly uses the metaphors of the human body, likened to the interior of a house, to illustrate a deficit of moral perception. A demonized person carries the stigma of ritual impurity, as indicated by the pollution words ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα.²⁰⁴ This ritual defilement is elaborated further and specifically imputed to Jesus' challengers in 11:39-48, 52, 49-51. At the end of the discourse the blindness of Jesus' opponents is total (13:35), a condition which recalls the sorry latter state of the demonized man of the parable.

As noted, 11:24-26 initiates Jesus' counter-labeling and counter-stigmatization of the group which tried to stigmatize and delegitimize him in 11:14-23 with a witchcraft accusation, a group

²⁰³ Physical infirmities were often thought to be caused by demonic influence. See John J. Pilch, "Sickness and Healing in Luke-Acts," in *Social World of Luke-Acts*, 181-209, esp. 202. Humphries suggests ("Kingdom of God," 139) that the point of the fable is to show that "demons do not cast out demons"; however, it is the cinching closing saying which supplies the key to the intended moral, and its focus is completely on the worsened state of the person.

²⁰⁴ See Nida and Louw, *Semantics*, 100.

likely identifiable with the Jerusalem elites.²⁰⁵ The saying, "The last state of that person becomes worse than the first," calls in question the legitimacy of Jesus' opponents—these agents of censure—to be custodians of Israel's' cult and purity system, for it denies them the wholeness requisite for participation in the cult.²⁰⁶ Moreover, the "defective sight" metaphor pervading the discourse attributes to Jesus' opponents a bodily defect which according to the Law disqualifies from sacred service (Lev 21:16-24).²⁰⁷ Physical infirmities—not to speak of demonization—rendered one ritually unclean.²⁰⁸ Jesus' burlesque of his opponents' purity regulations and his imputations of impurity, especially virulently defiling corpse impurity (particularly dangerous to priests), in 11:39b, 40, 44 escalates this program of counter-stigmatization and in effect delegitimizes their proprietorship of Temple and of Torah.²⁰⁹ Verse 51a provides a climactic conclusion to this escalating rhetoric by describing the ultimate desecration: a murder, a shedding of righteous blood, between the sanctuary and the altar, no less than the ninth level of holiness.²¹⁰ In contrast, the mute, demonized man healed by Jesus is thereby reconstituted a whole person.²¹¹

Horsley states that "language is by definition social and communicative, and both we and the texts we are interpreting pre-

²⁰⁵ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 172; Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Commentary*, 352. On the "reverse stigmatization" operation carried out by Jesus here see Ebertz, *Charisma*, 233-34.

²⁰⁶ See Pilch, "Sickness," 208, and Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 51.

²⁰⁷ Jerome H. Neyrey, "The Symbolic Universe of Luke-Acts: 'They turn the world upside down'," in *Social World*, 271-304, esp. 282, 285; Malina and Neyrey, *Calling*, 74.

²⁰⁸ Pilch, "Sickness," 207-209; Neyrey, "Symbolic Universe," 279; Goodman, *Ruling Class*, 107; Neusner, *Idea of Purity*, 15.

²⁰⁹ On the virulently contaminating power of corpse impurity see Sanders, *Practice & Belief*, 71-72, 433, Safrai, "Temple," 866, Neusner, *Idea of Purity*, 22, and Hannah K. Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis*, SBLDS 143 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 69. For a discussion of how the woes burlesque Shammaite purity regulations see Kloppenborg, "Nomos and Ethos," 39-40, idem, "Conflict and Invention," 15, and idem, "Social History," 97. See also Leif E. Vaage, "The Woes in Q (and Matthew and Luke): Deciphering the Rhetoric of Criticism," in *SBLSP* 27, ed. David Lull (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 582-601, and Moxnes, *Economy*, 112.

²¹⁰ See *m. Kelim* 1.6-9, and Kloppenborg, "Social History," 96.

²¹¹ Pilch, "Sickness," 208.

suppose some particular network of social relations.”²¹² In Q’s Controversy Discourse we see conflicted social relations expressing themselves in the very sequence of the text, which maps out in a precise manner social locations, social relations, sacred space, and profane space within a cosmic order marked out by the nexus of heaven and earth. These relations establish the coherence and cohesion of the Controversy Discourse which, moreover, works out a singular rhetorical strategy. Periphery and center, purity and pollution, light and darkness, sight and blindness hold the discourse together at the conceptual and symbolic level. “Body” or bodily faculties are important metaphors in the macro composition, an example of the virtually universal tendency to use the human body as a analogy to the social body.²¹³ The linear sequencing of the constituent units of the Discourse traces a downward trajectory from sight to blindness, revelation to hiddenness, blessing to judgment, to which corresponds a rapidly escalating rhetoric of counter-labelling and delegitimation.

The question arises as to whether Q’s Controversy Discourse should be classed with wisdom or prophecy, for it is here as nowhere else in Q that prophetic motifs and genres appear: criticism of official cult and ruling class; announcements of judgment; woes; conflicts between seer and officialdom.²¹⁴ However, criticism of official cult and its custodians come under the purview of sages as well as of prophets, for sages were interested in the correct maintenance through cult of the cosmic order which was the guarantor of the sapiential enterprise.²¹⁵ Apollonius of Tyana made it his business to reform the rites of temples, warned the Athenians of the imminent departure of the goddess because of

²¹² Horsley, “Questions about Redactional Strata,” 196. See also idem, “Innovation in Search of Reorientation: New Testament Studies Rediscovering Its Subject Matter,” *JAAAR* 62 (1994) 1127-66, esp. 1139.

²¹³ Donald G. MacRae, “The Body and Social Metaphor,” in *The Body as a Medium of Expression*, edited by Jonathan Benthall and Ted Polhemus (London: Penguin, 1975), 59-73; Sheldon R. Isenberg and Dennis E. Owen, “Bodies, Natural and Contrived: The Work of Mary Douglas,” *RelStRev* 3 (1977) 1-16.

²¹⁴ Sato, *Prophetic*, 196-97, citing Isa 28:7; Jer 2:8; 5:4f; Hos 4:4-10; Micah 3:5, 11.

²¹⁵ Perdue, *Cult*, 39-40, 54-55, 59-60, 98, 190, 225, 354, 358; *Sir* 24:10-11, 23-29 locates Wisdom in the twin media of redemption, Temple and Torah.

their profaning entertainments, and at times came into conflict with the priesthoods.²¹⁶

Moreover, the wisdom weave of this discourse is not nearly so thin as it looks at first, and prophetic genres, though present, do not necessitate the genre-critical classification of this discourse as prophetic speech. In the first place, three major sub-units of the macro-composition, 11:2-13; 11:14-23, and 11:29-35, were seen in the previous chapter to follow the genre conventions of instructional speeches. Secondly, we saw that the macro composition rotates around a central gnome, 11:26c, itself attached to a fable which, together with its concluding gnomic saying, represents a conventional wisdom form. Thirdly, though the opening macarism of 10:23-24 cannot be called a maxim, yet macarisms are common in sapiential discourse. In fact, the technique of beginning with a macarism and ending with a warning of judgment is attested for Q's Inaugural Sermon (6:20b-49), a sapiential composition. To be sure, the followers of Jesus are blessed because of revelation bestowed.²¹⁷ However, viewed in the context of the immediately preceding verses (10:21-22), the macarism can be seen expressing joy in *revealed wisdom* in the spirit of *Sir* 24 and *Wis* 7-9.²¹⁸ Moreover 10:23-24 is programmatic with respect to the discourse which follows. It states the *Leitmotif* of the discourse—sight and lack thereof—and the motifs of “eye” and “prophets and kings” sounded in 10:23-24 recur in 11:31-32, 34-35.²¹⁹ It may deliberately echo Isa 6:9: “Keep listening, but do not comprehend; keep looking, but do not understand.”²²⁰ The verses which follow (Isa 6:10-13) describe the people's inability to see and to hear and then end with a prediction of judgment. Similarly, the three instructions of Q's Controversy Discourse each develop a separate motif of 10:23-24. The prayer instruction elaborates on the privilege of access enjoyed by the elect group addressed with the blessing in 10:23. The Beelzebul and

²¹⁶ Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, I.2, 16; IV.19, 22, 24; V. 25; VIII.19.

²¹⁷ Perdue, “Wisdom Sayings,” 18, classifies 10:23 as an “apocalyptic saying”; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.120, as an apocalyptic macarism, and cites *Ps. Sol.* 17:44; 18:6 as parallels.

²¹⁸ See below, discussion of 10:21-22.

²¹⁹ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 152; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.123.

²²⁰ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.120, note 134.

Demand for a Sign speeches deal respectively with visible (healing exorcism) and audible (preaching of Jonah, wisdom of Solomon) manifestations, though to be sure, the programmatic visual metaphor is reasserted in 11:33-35. The phrases "did not see it" and "did not hear it" of 10:24 are thus unfolded in 11:14-23 and in 11:29-32. This makes 10:23-24 correspond functionally to 12:2, the programmatic opening of the Eschatological Discourse. Moreover, its relationship to the material in its discourse replicates the compositional structure of smaller instructional speeches such as 12:22-31 and 12:35-46, in which bipartite threshold sayings are broken down and elaborated separately in the main body of the composition.

Is it possible, however, to find a place for the accusation and announcement of judgment which occupies such a long stretch of this discourse (11:39-48, 52, 49-51), within the instructional framework genre? As Sato notes, woes can occur in wisdom texts where they function as warnings.²²¹ Threats of judgment frequently form part of the motivational apparatus of instructional speeches. The particular combination found in Q 11 matches a pattern attested in the instruction on testing and courage in *Sir* 2:1-17. The instruction opens with the conventional, "My child" (2:1a), and the programmatic admonition, "prepare yourself for testing" (2:1b). It then flows into a series of admonitions and consolations intended to help the righteous persevere in times of testing (2:2-11). However, verses 12-14 shift to a series of three woes directed to those who do not conform to the demands of the instruction: "Woe to timid hearts Woe to the fainthearted Woe to you who have lost your nerve!" A threat of judgment is appended to the last woe: "What will you do when the Lord's reckoning comes?" The concluding verses of the instruction (2:15-17) describe the attributes of "those who fear the Lord," and conclude with an admonition and motive clause. In both *Sir* 2:1-17 and Q 11 the instructional framework genre has appropriated woes and threats of judgment, in Q to aggressively promote the notion that in the person, proclamation, and wisdom of Jesus God's Kingdom is present. The strong prophetic tone is what might be expected from a subversive wisdom which seeks

²²¹ Sato, *Prophetic*, 188, 195-96, citing Qoh 4:10; 10:16.

“to subvert an existing social structure and provide for the formation of a different one.”²²²

Mission Instruction (Q 9:57-60; 10:2-16, 21-22)

Most studies of the Mission Instruction have concentrated on working out redaction (or tradition) histories and corresponding social histories embedded in postulated layers of the text. Schulz argues that 10:2-12 “ist traditionsgeschichtlich von Anfang an eine einheitliche Komposition gewesen,” introduced by the harvest saying in 10:2 and concluded by the λέγω ὑμῖν saying in 10:12.²²³ This latter verse, according to Schulz, is not the product of Q redaction but supplied the pretext for integrating 10:13-15 with 10:11. Lührmann suggests that the announcement of judgment redaction bound the primitive instruction to the “Drohwort” 10:13-15, with 10:12 providing the redactional link.²²⁴ Hoffmann takes 10:2-16 to be a layered text with 10:5-7 as the tradition-history core. His redaction history rests upon a social history which imputes to the earliest Jesus movement a concern for peace and reconciliation within the volatile political situation of first-century Palestine. Thus elements of the instruction which emphasize peace (10:5-7, and possibly 10:9) are primitive, while elements evincing a certain testiness are later additions (10:3, 10-11, 12, 13-15; like Lührmann Hoffmann takes 10:12 as a redactional link). However, the final product constitutes a unified whole.²²⁵ Zeller plots a redaction history along the arc of his social history: 10:3-12, 16—early wandering missionaries; 10:2—community formation; 10:22—Hellenistic-Jewish Christian reflection. It is not clear when 10:13-15 and 10:21 were added; however, Zeller agrees with Schulz that 10:12 cannot be put down to the redaction which attached 10:13-15, but rather served as a peg for attaching the latter.²²⁶ Schürmann takes the original core instruction to be 10:4-11, transmitted by an early group of wan-

²²² Perdue, “Social Character,” 6-9, 13, 25-26, esp. 6; see also Horsley, *Sociology*, 58.

²²³ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 409.

²²⁴ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 62.

²²⁵ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 288-89, 311; see also Schenk, *Synopse*, 55.

²²⁶ Zeller, *Kommentar*, 46, 48, 55, idem, “Grundschrift,” 390, and idem, “Redactional Processes,” 125.

dering prophets, in turn combined with Luke 10:1-2a, Matt 10:5-6, and Luke 10:8-11 to form a primitive instructional speech. This was then "redaktionell um Logien erweitert worden, die negative Erfahrungen spiegeln," namely, 10:3, 12, 13-15, 16.²²⁷ Kloppenborg extends the boundaries of the final instruction to include 9:57-62 and 10:21-24. Invoking genre considerations he posits a core sapiential unit consisting of 10:3-11, 16 (with verses 3 and 16 forming an *inclusio*) directed at itinerants. Verses 2, 7b, directed at groups expected to support such itinerants, reflect a broader ecclesial setting and thus are additions to the core instruction. The chreias of 9:57-62, which inculcate discipleship, were added to the core instruction as part of the same ecclesial expansion. The prophetic woes in 10:13-15 along with the redactional clasp 10:12 (all differing from the core sapiential instruction form-critically and generically, in audience, in tone, and breaking the catch-word connection δέχομαι/ἀκούω between 10:10, 16), were interpolated between 10:11 and 10:16 by the announcement of judgment redaction of Q, provoked by the tradent group's experience of rejection. Since 10:21-24 displays the sectarian self-understanding which accompanies social alienation, it was added by the same redaction.²²⁸ Catchpole takes 10:3-12 as an unstratified core mission instruction stemming from Jesus. Q redaction added 10:2, 13-15, 16, and Matt 10:5b for the purpose of adapting the old instructions for use in the post-Easter mission to Israel. Catchpole rejects the notion that 10:16 is the primitive conclusion of the instruction—it coheres well with the redactional 10:2, and thus 10:12 gives the original instructions a solid conclusion. The woes in 10:13-15 are secondary because of the shift in audience and the fact that they imply a post-mission setting.²²⁹ Uro views the Mission speech as a layered text which preserves traces of a movement from a positive mission to Israel by wandering charismatics (10:4-11) to a layer tinged with pessimism caused by Israel's rejection of the message (10:3-16) to a final ecclesiastical redaction responsible for the textualization of the speech (9:57ff; 10:2, 21-22), carried out within settled communi-

²²⁷ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.83, and idem, "Zeugnis," 147.

²²⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 190-203, idem, "Antique Instructional Genres," 146-47, and idem, "Easter Faith," 75.

²²⁹ David R. Catchpole, "The Mission Charge in Q," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 147-74.

ties.²³⁰ Sato takes 10:3a, 4-7a (8a), 9-11 as the early collection. Elements which presume hostile reception later augmented this basic instruction (10:3b, 12, 13-15). Since 10:2 assumes a broader group than the itinerants addressed in the core speech, it likewise is secondary. Sato designates 9:57-62 an apophthegmatic introduction to the mission speech placed there by the redaction which incorporated it into Q.²³¹ According to Jacobson the final speech extends from 9:57-10:22. He takes 10:4-11 as a primitive, positive instruction, to which were added 10:3, 16 to provide a framework. He argues that 9:59-60, because of the radicality of its demands, was part of the primitive instruction transmitted by itinerants. The formative deuteronomistic redaction, with its negative emphasis on judgment, then added 10:2 (taking "harvest" to refer to judgment), 12, 13-15. At the same time 9:57-58 was added because it profiles rejection. The result was transformation of original positive instructions into an errand of judgment. Verses 21-22, allegedly stemming from the reflections of a sectarian group which has passed through the experience of rejection and no longer envisions response from Israel, was added after the formative deuteronomistic redaction, for deuteronomistic tradition knows nothing of thanksgiving for Israel's unbelief (taking "wise and intelligent" to refer to Israel).²³² Laufen posits a single Q redaction which created the speech, consisting of 10:2-16, around the core tradition 10:4-11. He agrees with other scholars that the judgment motif was a major factor in this redaction. But according to Laufen, the theme of judgment already pervades the core tradition; therefore, the utility of this motif for separating later redactions from earlier, supposedly more positive and optimistic tradition is questionable. Rather the Q redactor in this case simply expanded on the judgment theme of 10:4-11 by adding 10:2-3, 12, 13-15, 16.²³³

Common to virtually all of these redaction histories is the tendency to see at least 10:4-11 as a core tradition expanded by various redactions reflecting changes in the socio-historical situation of the tradents, with the number of proposed redactions

²³⁰ Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 185-99.

²³¹ Sato, *Prophetie*, 37-38, 310; idem, "Prophetie oder Weisheit?" 399.

²³² Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 145-49.

²³³ Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 270-77, 286-92.

ranging from one to three. Most place the formation of the speech on extended diachronic trajectories following the course of various social histories, frequently that of the “wandering itinerants” to “settled communities,” itself not infrequently coordinated with an “optimistic” to “pessimistic” shift in mood and a shift in mission to Israel to reflection on failure of that mission.

When analyzed from a perspective which searches for indicators of textual cohesion, the Mission Instruction displays a macro arrangement with a configuration resembling those of the Eschatological and Controversy Discourses, namely, opening and closing framework units enclosing carefully sequenced units:

- A. Lowly Son of Man (υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) (9:57-58)
 - Homeless on earth (foxes' holes) and sky (birds' nests) (πετεῖνὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ)
 - Children give up father (πατέρα), family, patrimony (9:57-60)
 - Gathering of followers around the Son of Man (9:57-60)
- B. I send you... (ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς) (10:2-3)
 - Three-link commissioning chain: “Lord of harvest send labourers (τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας)...Go! Behold, I send you (ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς)”
- C. Instruction
 - Announcement of peace, the Kingdom (10:4-11)
 - Houses/cities accept; houses/cities reject
 - Miracles performed
 - Locale of proclamation: towns and cities
- Central Saying:* D. “I tell you, it shall be more tolerable on that day for Sodom than for that city” (10:12)
- C’ Woes; Announcement of judgment (10:13-15)
 - Rejecting cities (Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum), accepting cities (Tyre, Sidon)
 - Miracles performed
 - Locale of woe-proclamation: towns and cities
- B’ Him who sent me (τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με) (10:16)
 - Three-link commissioning chain: “Whoever receives you receives me, and whoever receives me receives him who sent me.”
- A’ Exalted Son (υἱόν) of the Heavenly Father (πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς) (10:21-22)

Father lord of heaven and earth (κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς)
 New family (πάτηρ...νηπίοις...υἱός)
 All things given to the Son by the Father (πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ
 τοῦ πατρός)
 Elect community founded on Son's privileged revelation (ἀπεκάλυ-
 ψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις...ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι)

Like the others, this macro arrangement sorts itself out along the lines of the form-critical boundaries defining the units which constitute it. The Mission Instruction sequences its units so as to work out a unified linear elaboration, beginning with 9:57-69 and culminating in 10:21-22.

Though the constituent materials of the opening chreias (9:57-60) and the closing thanksgiving and revealer sayings (10:21-22) have diverse tradition-history origins, in *Q* both are compositional unities as regards form and function.²³⁴ The two units are connected by a thick weave of key word recurrence and semantic continuities and antitheses, and hence form a framework around intervening units.²³⁵ In particular, thick distribution of key words and motifs from the semantic field of "family" links 9:57-60 with 10:21-22 (υἱός, πατέρα, πάτηρ, νηπίοις, υἱός; homelessness, home, familial obligations). It is here that the first *inversion* between the two units appears: in 9:57-60 Jesus presents himself as the lowly, marginalized Son of Man, whereas in 10:21-22 he appears transformed as the glorious and exalted son of the heavenly Father.²³⁶ The Son of Man saying (9:58) is itself double-edged, even ironic, for it invokes the image of the authori-

²³⁴ Bultmann, *History*, 28; Wanke, "Kommentarworte," 216-18; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.47, 115-16; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 135-36, 145-49; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 191, 198; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 215, 435-36; Vaage, "Son of Man Sayings," 114; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 109; idem, "The Redaction of *Q* and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch," in *Gospel Behind the Gospels*, 159-98, esp. 180; Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 343; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 65; Zeller, *Kommentar*, 52; Schenk, *Synopse*, 58; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 368; Polag, *Christologie*, 161.

²³⁵ Proposing that 9:57-60 and 10:21-22 form a framework around the mission speech are Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 75; Sato, *Prophetie*, 37, and Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.124, all of whom, however, include 10:23-24. Hoffmann, "Redaction of *Q*," 186, notes a correspondence between 9:58 and 10:22 based on shared Son of Man conceptuality.

²³⁶ See Bultmann, *History*, 28, and Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.104, 109. This is not unlike the transformation of Krishna in the *Bhagavad Gita*: in the beginning Arjuna's chariot driver; in the end revealed in his true identity as an awesome being.

tative Son of Man from Jewish tradition and from other passages in Q.²³⁷ Though the sayings in 10:21-22 do not explicitly mention "Son of Man," yet the entrusting of authority to the Son by the Father is likewise rooted in Son of Man conceptions.²³⁸ Son of Man motifs in 9:58-60 and Wisdom motifs in 10:21-22 also cohere, for in certain circles in Second Temple Judaism these two mythical figures were viewed as converging.²³⁹ Hence the framework relationship of 9:57-60 and 10:21-22 articulates an irony: the Son of Man of 9:58 is lowly and marginalized, yet the title "Son of Man" connotes authority in the guise of the itinerant, homeless preacher. This ironic reference becomes explicit in 10:21-22, which openly ascribes to Jesus authoritative status in terms drawn from Son of Man and Wisdom traditions. This ironic play between 9:57-60 and 10:21-22 may evince an intertextual connection to Psalm 8, which articulates the paradox of the lowly son of man nevertheless given lordship over heaven and earth.²⁴⁰ Psalm 8:3 LXX refers to "babes and infants,"

²³⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 192; Tödt, *Son of Man*, 123. Robinson's argument that with "Son of Man" in 9:58 Q refers to Jesus merely as the archetypal human being (James M. Robinson, "The Son of Man in the Sayings Gospel Q," in *Tradition und Translation. Zum Problem der interkulturellen Übersetzbarkeit religiöser Phänomene*, ed. Christoph Elsas, et al. (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1994), 315-35, esp. 321), while perhaps useful as a tradition-history evaluation of that unit, is predicated upon Robinson's practice of distributing Q's Son of Man sayings throughout postulated redaction-history layers, and then interpreting the Q significance of those sayings in a somewhat isolated, individualized manner within those strata, rather than appraising Q's present text as a network of vital semantic relations.

²³⁸ von Lips, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 277; Zeller, *Kommentar*, 54. Hoffmann, "Redaction of Q," 186, as noted suggests a correspondence between 9:58 and 10:22 based on a shared Son of Man conceptuality, and suggests a similar correspondence between 6:23 and 6:46. To this can be added that the framework units of the Eschatological Discourse (12:2-12; 22:28-30) similarly contrast a situation of marginalization with a final situation of prestige within the Son of Man motif field. The appearance of Son of Man material in compositionally prominent positions (in the smaller instructional speeches as well as in the macro-compositions) corroborates Hoffmann's views on the influence of the Son of Man motif on the redaction of Q.

²³⁹ Celia Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke. Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25-30*, JSNTSuppl 18 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 104.

²⁴⁰ Mahlon H. Smith, "No Place for a Son of Man," *Forum* 4/4 (1988) 83-107, esp. 102. Francis J. Moloney, "The Reinterpretation of Psalm VIII and the Son of Man Debate," *NTS* 27 (1980-81) 656-72, argues from targumic evidence that within post-biblical Judaism the generic "man" of Psalm 8 was being interpreted in the direction of the "Son of Man".

(νηπίων καὶ θηλαζόντων), and νηπίοι figure prominently in Q 10:21, as do πάση τῇ γῇ...τῶν οὐρανῶν (see Psalm 8:2) and in 9:58 υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (see Psalm 8:5, 9). Psalm 8 may, therefore, have provided the Q editor with the elaborative model, the “convention”, to follow in setting up the framework units 9:57-60 and 10:21-22.

Other ironic inversions occur between the framework units. In 9:57-58 the Son of Man wanders homeless in creation, a worse state than even that of the fox who has a hole in the earth and the birds of the air who make nests. Steinhauser suggests that the mention of “foxes” and “birds,” land and sky creatures respectively, signifies the universality of creation.²⁴¹ In 10:21-22 the “son” addresses as “father” the “lord of heaven and earth.”²⁴² Correspondingly, the framework arrangement inscribes a trajectory from “hidden,” in the sense that in 9:57-58 important aspects of the nature of the protagonist are veiled in a riddling manner, to “revealed,” in as much as in 10:21-22 Jesus declares openly his divine offices and affiliations.²⁴³ This replicates the plot structure of *Oedipus Tyrannus*, which opens by posing a riddle of identity resolved at the end of the play.²⁴⁴ The framework units of the neighboring Controversy Discourse (10:23-24; 13:34-35) inscribe a movement in the opposite direction—from “revealed” to “hidden”, and those of Eschatological Discourse from the hidden nature of the kingdom to its revelation (12:2-3; 22:28-30).

It is at this point that the crucial legitimating function of the

²⁴¹ Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 116-17; see also Karl Löning, “Die Füchse, die Vögel und der Menschensohn (Mt 8,19f par Lk 9,57f),” in *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus*, eds. Hubert Frankemölle and Karl Kertelge (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1989), 82-102, esp. 92-93, 95.

²⁴² Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.108.

²⁴³ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.115. Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 369, states, “Ähnlich wie in den Viten Plutarchs, bei Mose [Philo and Artapanus], Apollonius und Pythagoras ist die Göttlichkeit des Helden den Menschen verborgen (Vita Alex 2,15,1, ‘Die Perser aber sahen Alexander voll Verwunderung über seine kleine Gestalt an, wußten sie doch nicht, daß in einem kleinen Gefäß der Glanz eines übermenschlichen Geschicks verborgen war’).” A motif present in some ancient myths is the initial hiddenness of the god or goddess in unremarkable form, who suddenly, at a crucial point, reveals himself or herself to certain of the human personae of the story. This is characteristic of some Dionysus myths (for example, Euripides, *Bacchae*), and of some Isis and Demeter myths.

²⁴⁴ Havelock, “Oral Composition,” 189-90. I am not suggesting a literary relationship but the presence of a common device.

framework units becomes obvious, for with the exalted status and exclusivity Jesus claims in his self-revelation he asserts his authority to demand disciples to follow him in a manner which offends against social convention and to commission them to carry a message of judgment throughout Galilee.²⁴⁵ Accordingly, the framework simultaneously constitutes and legitimates a community of "Offenbarungsempfängern"²⁴⁶ and endows them with the charismatic authority requisite for a mission of salvation and judgment.²⁴⁷ Uro notes that 10:4-11 is replete with symbolic actions which bespeak a charismatic consciousness on the part of the messengers.²⁴⁸ It is in this constitution of a community of disciples under the charismatic authority of Jesus that the family language so pervasive in 9:57-60 and 10:21-22 plays a key role. The disciples detach themselves from father, home, and normative social obligations in 9:57-60 for a new vocation, but in 10:21-22, in a super-compensatory manner, they are integrated as babes into a new family group in which God is father.²⁴⁹ The group is reconstituted an elect community (*Heilsgemeinde*) by virtue of the revelation imparted to them but withheld from others, ironically, the "sages and learned," most likely referring to the Jerusalem religious elites who move into the picture in the next discourse.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁵ Kuchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 557; Martin Hengel, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*, trans. James C. G. Greig (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981), 23-25; see also Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 75, Schenk, *Synopse*, 58-59, Piper, *Wisdom*, 172-73, Ebertz, *Charisma*, 73, and Sato, *Prophetie*, 37.

²⁴⁶ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 109; see also Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 75, Piper, *Wisdom*, 172-73, and Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.101.

²⁴⁷ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 36, 139, 305; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 99-100; see also Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 172, 200, Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.68.

²⁴⁸ Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 158.

²⁴⁹ Malina and Neyrey, *Calling*, 13, 16; Kloppenborg, "Social History," 90; see also Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.40, and Sato, *Prophetie*, 37.

²⁵⁰ See George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion of Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity," in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, and "Others" in Late Antiquity*, eds. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), 73-91, esp. 78-79, 89, von Lips, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 271, Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 220, Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 366-70, Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.119, Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 99-100, Ebertz, *Charisma*, 236-37, and Lemaire, "School and Temple," 180. Some scholars try to interpret the "wise and learned" as a reference to Q's rejection of Israel as a whole, but this is a supercessionist imposition upon the text. Jer 8:8-9, following hard upon a denunciation of the Jerusalem cult and the religious and political elites who benefit from it (Jer 7:1-34; 8:1-7), denounces precisely this group in language reminiscent of Q

Hence the framework units of the Mission Discourse set up a tension: a socially stigmatized group (9:58-60) identifies itself as being in reality a privileged, elect group (10:21-22), endowed with charismatic authority for its mission.²⁵¹

The framework units of the Mission Instruction forge smooth linear connections to adjacent units. The rejection of the Son of Man described in 7:31-35 prepares for the portrayal of the Son of Man's homelessness in 9:58.²⁵² Moving forward through the text, the rigorous demands of 9:57-60 act as boundary requirements for recruits. Those who pass the tests of 9:57-60 are instructed in their new vocation in 10:2-16.²⁵³ The other framework unit acts as a hymnic culmination to the Discourse as a whole. Hymns in fact frequently signal that a section of text has reached its conclusion.²⁵⁴ Zeller suggests that 10:21-22 solves the problem of the "rejection of the message of the imminent reign of God, which is attributed to the Father's concealing activity," and with "babes" makes reference both to the messengers and to those who accept their message.²⁵⁵ Thus 10:21-22 takes a retrospective look over the mission and picks up the acceptance-rejection thematic treated in 10:6-15.²⁵⁶ So strong are the hymn's thematic connections with the immediately following blessing that frequently 10:21-22 and 10:23-24 are taken to be a single compositional unit bringing closure to the Mission Instruction. The privilege of "seeing" which the disciples enjoy elaborates upon the reference to ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις.... ὃ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι in the preceding unit, and Jesus' prayer to his

10:21b: "How can you say, 'We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us,' when, in fact, the false pen of the scribes has made it into a lie? The wise shall be put to shame, they shall be dismayed and taken; since they have rejected the word of the Lord, what wisdom is in them?"

²⁵¹ See Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), 166-67, for a discussion of this social phenomenon.

²⁵² Tödt, *Son of Man*, 122; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 27; Löning, "Füchse," 85, 89-90.

²⁵³ See Sato, "Weisheit oder Prophetie?" 396; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.58.

²⁵⁴ Achtemeier, "Omne Verbum Sonat," 24, citing Romans 11:33-36; see also Sir 10:14-18.

²⁵⁵ Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 126. Νήπιος can also be a synonym for a disciple; see Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 108.

²⁵⁶ Kloppenborg, "Social History," 92; see also Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.106.

father in 10:21-22 prepares for the Prayer instruction in 11:2-13.²⁵⁷ Finally, the invocation of God in a prayer of thanksgiving and praise, as well as the establishing of an alternative heaven-earth axis through the profiling of the Revelator, sets the stage for the critique of the official cult and its custodians in 11:2-52; 13:34-35.

Despite their thematic affinity, however, both 10:21-22 and 10:23-24 remain self-contained units. In addition to the change in address, there is a striking absence of any key word connection between them which might justify construing them as a single unit. Conversely, each has close key word and conceptual affinities with its respective discourse. Nevertheless, the view that 10:21-24 is one compositional unit is not wholly incorrect. Q 10:21-22 and 10:23-24, the one concluding the second discourse and the other inaugurating the third, by definition constitute the *center* of Q. It is surely no accident that here we find the Revealer profiled as well as his elect community. This corresponds to the macro-compositional pattern of the *Golden Verses*; similarly, *Sir* 24, also centrally positioned, profiles the Revelatrice Wisdom. Sheppard notes that *Sir* 24's "place at the middle of the book...is indicative of its priority in defining the total context of the book."²⁵⁸

The two units adjacent to the framework units are 10:2-3 and 10:16. Q scholars are widely agreed that an *inclusio* connection exists between them signaled by the recurrence of the key motif-word ἀποστέλλω....ἀποστείλαντα.²⁵⁹ Ἐκβάλη (10:2) in this context is a synonymous expression. This *inclusio* demarcates the outer boundaries of the Mission instructions *per se*.

Scholarship has tended to solve the problem of the seemingly bad editorial joint between 10:2 and 10:3 by resorting to redaction and social histories, most popular being the notion that in

²⁵⁷ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.118, 121, 178-79, 182-83.

²⁵⁸ Gerald R. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament* (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1980), 21.

²⁵⁹ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 145, 148; Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 166; Vaage, *Upstarts*, 37; Schenk, *Synopse*, 57; Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 87; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 286; Crossan, *In Fragments*, 110; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 199-200. Also widely agreed upon is the form-critical and tradition-history distinction of 10:2-3 and 10:16 in relation to the core mission instruction in 10:4-11. See Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 166, Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.85, Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 101, and Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 250, 272.

the addition of 10:2 one can detect a shift from a primitive itinerant situation (10:3) to a settled ecclesiastical context.²⁶⁰ Such recourses do not seem necessary, however, in this case. Studies in the composition of Proverbs have shown that sometimes sayings of different provenance and utilizing different words are juxtaposed for the purpose of mutual commentary, generating reflection, or presenting two or more sides of a single issue.²⁶¹ Moreover, 10:2, invoking as it does the motif of harvest and laborers, introduces a wisdom topos: work. To this is appended 10:3, which strikes another wisdom topos: instructions for messengers. The instruction which follows in verses 4-11 expands upon both topoi, with 10:4-8 taking up (rather unconventionally to be sure) the standard wisdom linkage between labor and provisioning, and 10:9-11 the topos of the duties of messengers. We have already encountered elsewhere in Q this compositional technique of stating at the threshold two interconnected programmatic topics, each of which is then treated in more detail in the body of the speech (10:23-24; 12:22; 12:35, possibly 11:14-16). When it is recognized that 10:2a, "The harvest is plentiful, but the laborers are few," is likely an independent maxim,²⁶² then we have before us the elements of an instruction: *opening general maxim* (10:2a) followed by *two programmatic admonitions*: (a) "Pray, therefore, the lord of the harvest that he send laborers to his harvest"; (b) "Go! Behold, I send you as lambs among wolves," with the second admonition adapting the harvest and worker metaphor to that of a mission and messengers.²⁶³

That the juxtaposition of verses 2 and 3 is due to a calculated editorial act indebted to specific genre conventions is supported by the fact that 10:2-3, taken together, and 10:16, its *inclusio* counterpart, both construct a three-link commissioning chain, God-Jesus-messengers, which traces the authorization of the messengers back to God. In both compositional units God ("Lord of the harvest,"²⁶⁴ "He who sent me") assumes the ultimate position, Jesus ("Go! I send you"; "Whoever receives you

²⁶⁰ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 147-48; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 193; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 270; Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 99; Sato, *Prophetie*, 38.

²⁶¹ Whybray, *Composition*, 80, citing Prov 15:1-2; 11:10-11; 16:18-19.

²⁶² Piper, *Wisdom*, 133.

²⁶³ For a parallel see the discussion of Sir 27:30-28:7 in chapter two.

²⁶⁴ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 88; Polag, *Christologie*, 70.

receives me") the middle position, and the messengers the third position in the commissioning chain.²⁶⁵ This correspondence suggests that verses 2 and 3 were juxtaposed to correspond to the *Shaliah* of verse 16. Both create a "Kette der Bevollmächtigung"²⁶⁶ and thus function as a legitimating inner framework around the tense instructions and the weighty message of the arrival of the kingdom in 10:4-11.²⁶⁷ This shows the level of authorization necessary for a mission announcing salvation and judgment.

These units effect a linear transition between the framework units (9:57-60; 10:21-22) and the mission instructions which they bracket (10:4-11 [12-15]). The commissioning of 10:2-3 follows logically after the call to discipleship of 9:57-60, introducing recruits to their new vocation. Similarly 10:16, with its reference to those who "receive" the messengers, prepares for the thanksgiving of 10:21-22, and like the thanksgiving profiles the relationship, mediated by Jesus, between God and the group. "Lambs among wolves" anticipates both the equipment/provisioning instructions of 10:4-8, which render the missionaries particularly vulnerable and dependent, and the messenger instructions of 10:10-11, foreboding as it does hostile reaction to their proclamation.²⁶⁸

Though opinions vary about the course of events in tradition history which produced 10:4-11 and the seams perhaps still visible within it, most commentators agree that in its present form it functions rhetorically as a single unit.²⁶⁹ What is less well rec-

²⁶⁵ Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 286, 291; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 288, 304-305; Schenk, *Synopse*, 57. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, points out that 10:2 makes God the proximate sender, while 10:3 assigns that role to Jesus (193). While this shows distinct tradition-history provenances for 10:2b and 10:3, the effect of their present juxtaposition is still to create a three-link chain, with ultimate responsibility for sending resting with the "lord of the harvest." The notion of deputization and of Jesus as mediator between God and the disciples is expressed in 10:21-22. There Jesus addresses God as the one who has revealed "these things" to babes, but 10:22 makes it clear that Jesus is the intermediary.

²⁶⁶ Polag, *Christologie*, 70, speaking solely of 10:16, but apposite to 10:2-3 as well. Kloppenborg notes the chiastic composition of 10:16 which with the emphatic pronouns ἐμὲ...ἐμὲ emphasizes Jesus as the "essential element in that chain" between God and the preachers ("Easter Faith," 88).

²⁶⁷ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 304-305.

²⁶⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 194; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 324-25; Schenk, *Synopse*, 51-52.

²⁶⁹ Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 169-72; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 241, 246, 251; Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 106-11, 161; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 288, 296, 301-303; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.63, 68-71, 75, 77, 98.

ognized or even denied²⁷⁰ is that 10:4-11, as regards genre, is an *instruction* which integrates the topoi of provisioning, behavior at table, obtaining and showing hospitality, and instructions for messengers. *Ankhseshongy* 17:14 urges, "Do not walk the road without a stick in your hand." *Syr. Men.* 217-26 contains an instruction for obtaining hospitality which in its advice on how to distinguish hospitable from inhospitable places is similar to Q 10:5-11:

And when you are going to your friend,
if your friend (really) loves you
and (if) you are (really) dear to him,
his children will show you that outwardly.
If they eagerly watch for your presence,
be convinced that your friend loves you,
and that you are dear to him.
But if his children do not eagerly watch for your coming,
even he, your friend, is unwilling to see you...
Leave, go home!

Though less momentous than Q 10:5-11, this instruction shares crucial elements with the latter: approaching a place for hospitality; determination of hospitality or lack of it based upon a certain reaction; an exhortation to leave an inhospitable person or place. To this can be added a multitude of instructions prescribing proper deportment at table, especially when enjoying another's hospitality, for example, "If you are one of the guests at the table of one who is greater than you, accept what he gives when it is set before you" (*Ptahhotep* 6:10-7:2).²⁷¹ Wilhelm Frankenberg states,

Die Vorschriften über das Benehmen beim Gastmahl waren ein sehr wichtiges Stück des Unterrichtes bei den alten *hakamim*; sie schärften ihren Zöglingen ganz genau ein, bei wem sie zu Gaste gehen sollten, bei wem nicht, wie sie sich bei Tische legen sollten, wie sie sich Speisen zu nehmen hatten, wie und wieviel sie essen sollten, wie man sich bei der Unterhaltung benimmt, wenn es Zeit sei aufzustehen u.s.w.²⁷²

²⁷⁰ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 50-51; Horsley, "Logoi Propheton?" 198-200; Sato, "Prophetic oder Weisheit," 400; Hoffmann, "Redaction of Q" 188. See also Williams, "Parable and Chreia," 104, and Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 118.

²⁷¹ Other examples are *Syr. Men.* 149-58, 181-84, 262-77, *Sir* 31:12-32:13, *Kagemni* I, 5, *Any* (Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature* 2.136-37, 142), *Satire of the Trades* (Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature* 1.190).

²⁷² Frankenberg, "Die Schrift des Menander," 236.

Work was another common topic for instruction, frequently placed in a harvest or agricultural setting and linked with the virtue of self-sufficiency.²⁷³ "The worker deserves his wage" (10:7) is a gnome obviously connected to work wisdom. The maxim, "The harvest is plentiful but the laborers are few," reflects both agricultural and work themes. In an inversion of traditional wisdom typical of Q, verses 4-8 repudiate the traditional virtue of self-sufficiency, which traditional wisdom promised as the reward of an honest day's work in the fields, in favor of living from the support of others. In the context of traditional society, the behavior recommended in Q 10:4-8 would be shameful.²⁷⁴ The instructions in verses 8-11 (including 10:3), are a specimen of instruction for messengers. For example, *Satire of the Trades* advises, "When an official sends you with a message, tell it as he told it, don't omit, don't add to it." *Ptahhotep* 7:4-5 urges, "If you are a trusted man whom one magnate sends to another, be utterly exact when he sends you. Do business for him exactly as he says; beware of calumny in speech which might embroil one magnate with another, to the distortion of truth."²⁷⁵

Finally, 10:4-11 taken as a whole is a specimen of what Kayatz has labeled "kasuistische" instructions, that is, instructions which cite a recurring situation by means of an "if" or "when-ever" clause, and then deliver one or more admonitions for dealing skillfully with the adduced situation.²⁷⁶ *Ptahhotep* 5:10-6:1 is an example of such an instruction and offers structural parallels to Q 10:5-11:

If you find a disputant arguing, one having authority and superior to you, bend down your arms and bow your back....If you find a disputant arguing, your equal who is on your own level, let your

²⁷³ See *Ps.-Phoc.* 153-74, Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 393-404.

²⁷⁴ Both *Ps.-Phoc.* 153-74 and *Works and Days* 393-404 assume that seeking subsistence at one's neighbors is the consequence of idleness and is a shameful evil to be avoided.

²⁷⁵ Another example is embedded in the Elisha narrative (2 Kings 4:29-31); two other examples are found in Jer 36:6; 51:59-64 (adduced by Sato, *Prophetie*, 311). The difference between Q's instructions and those of Elisha and Jeremiah are that the latter are directed to a specific, non-recurring situation, while the former are framed as "casuistic" instructions formulated for recurring situations.

²⁷⁶ Kayatz, *Studien*, 15-16, 26-27. Krispenz, *Spruchkompositionen*, 136-38, prefers to speak of "konditional eingeleiteten Einheiten."

virtue be manifest against him....If you find a disputant arguing, a humble man who is not your equal, do not be aggressive against him in proportion as he is humble....

Here three different situations are given and three appropriate responses enjoined, just as in Q 10:5-11 two possible reactions are envisioned (acceptance or rejection) and two different responses recommended. These different instructional topoi have been woven into an integrated instruction for the Q messengers introduced by the maxim and programmatic admonitions in 10:2-3.

The form-critical characteristics of the next sequence in the macro arrangement, the woes of 10:13-15 (on verse 12 see below), could hardly be more different.²⁷⁷ The dramatic shift from sapiential to prophetic genre, the change in audience, and the choice of the threatening tone of an announcement of judgment have convinced a number of Q scholars that verses 13-15 have intruded into an earlier instruction more sanguine about the prospects for the mission, and that this occurred under the influence of a redaction provoked by the bitter experience of rejection.²⁷⁸ The notion that the woes have no primitive connection with the instructions of 10:4-11 is surely correct. However, when the macro-compositional connections of 10:13-15 are appraised and the capacity of the instructional framework genre to incorporate prophetic genres is recognized, it becomes clear that the woes are anything but intrusive.

Verses 4-11 and 13-15, an instruction and announcement of judgment respectively, display strong interconnections.²⁷⁹ Cohesion-establishing semantic equivalents (representative of crucial motifs) in more than one domain are well distributed. These include words for "cities" or "towns"—πόλιν...πόλιν...τῆς πόλεως (10:8, 10); Χοραζίν...Βηθσαιδά...Τύρω καὶ Σιδῶνι...Καφαρναούμ

²⁷⁷ For tradition-history analyses of 10:13-15 see Sato, *Prophetie*, 131, Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 63, Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 274, Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.83, and Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 361-62.

²⁷⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 195, 199; idem, "Antique Instructional Genres," 146-47, gives the most comprehensive justification of this position. See also Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 162, Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 145, and the synopsis above.

²⁷⁹ In the Controversy Discourse an instruction (11:2-13) and an announcement of judgment (11:39-48, 52, 49-51) likewise cohere within the overall textual arrangement.

(10:13-15)—and words for miracles—*θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθενοῦντας* (10:9); αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γινόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν (10:13).²⁸⁰ Both units feature some form of urgent proclamation to cities—“The kingdom God has come near to you” (10:9); “Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you...” (10:13-15). Both units rate highly the performance of miracles. In the first, miracles attend the proclamation of the arrival of the kingdom, either to encourage acceptance of the message or as a result of acceptance (10:9).²⁸¹ In the second, miracles are adduced in support of the reproach for the cities’ unrepentant attitude (10:13). The infrastructure of both units is built upon an acceptance/rejection dichotomy. Verses 4-11 sort towns and cities, described generically, into two classes: those that accept and those that reject.²⁸² Similarly, verses 13-15 describe Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capharnaum as cities that rejected the message, and then adduce for comparative purposes two cities, Tyre and Sidon, who “would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes,” given the same opportunity.

Most scholars affirm a motif connection between the units. Kloppenborg argues that the motif of rejection present in 10:10-11 supplies the pretext for the redactional placement of 10:13-15.²⁸³ Other scholars suggest that the instructions already contain intimations of the judgment which the woes make explicit. While the tone of judgment is not nearly so strident in 10:4-11 as it is in 10:13-15, the instructions urge the messengers to enact a symbolic gesture towards a rejecting city—the shaking of dust from the feet—which may portend judgment. Though its precise significance is a matter of debate, this gesture is apposite to a prophetic warning stance not a great deal different from that from which the woes are pronounced.²⁸⁴ The note of judgment,

²⁸⁰ See Nida and Louw, *Semantics*, 85.

²⁸¹ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 408; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.74.

²⁸² In the setting of small Galilean towns, the distinction between houses and towns is not a significant one. See Kloppenborg, “Social History,” 90, and Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.75. Noting the acceptance/rejection dichotomy in 10:4-11 are Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 408, note 32, Catchpole, “Mission Charge,” 171, Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 220, and Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 70.

²⁸³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 195, 199; idem, “Antique Instructional Genres,” 146. See also Horsley, “Social Conflict,” 50.

²⁸⁴ Arguing that the gesture portends judgment are Sato, *Prophetie*, 306, 313, Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.76, Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 157-58, Hoffmann, *Studien*, 63, Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 259, Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 68, and Bovon, *Lukas*, 459.

therefore, sounds out clearly in 10:4-11, even if more resoundingly in 10:13-15.²⁸⁵ The appearance of the God-sent messengers, their announcement of the kingdom, and their charismatic actions place the towns and their constituent households in an “Entscheidungssituation” upon whose outcome hangs either dereliction or incorporation into the elect.²⁸⁶ Thus the demonstrative activities in 10:4-11 are predicated upon the possibility of judgment. The announcement of judgment in 10:13-15 spells this out, invoking the paradigmatic judgment upon the king of Babylon (10:15; compare Isa 14:11-15).²⁸⁷

In the Eschatological Discourse, the forward movement from the Discern the Times instruction (12:49-59) to the Day of the Son of Man instruction (17:23-37) works out an identical elaborative pattern. Discern the Times puts to its audience the necessity of a decision, urging it to recognize the present crisis and act accordingly. Similarly to 10:4-11, in which the message of the arrival of the kingdom confronts the closely knit village social structure constituted by various households,²⁸⁸ it envisions the crisis of decision as entailing a separation which affects natural social bonds. The Day of the Son of Man instruction then gives explicit expression to the judgment anticipated in 12:49-59, just as the Woes Against the Galilean Cities depicts graphically the actual downfall of certain towns which reject the messengers and like 17:23-37 invokes paradigmatic examples of judgment upon Gentiles. The Woes Against the Galilean Cities engineers a change in tone within the Mission Instruction identical to the darkening of mood brought about by the shift to the Woes in the Controversy Discourse (11:39-52), for both react to rejections mentioned in preceding units by adopting a more threatening voice (similarly to 10:9, 11:20 announces the Kingdom). Moreover, like the Day of the Son of Man instruction in 17:23-35 and the Woes of 11:39-52, the announcement of judgment against the Galilean

²⁸⁵ Schürmann, “Zeugnis,” 150; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 289; Polag, *Christologie*, 70; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 286-87.

²⁸⁶ Polag, *Christologie*, 70, 72; Schürmann, “Zeugnis,” 150; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 411; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 287; see also Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 185, Hoffmann, *Studien*, 63, Sato, *Prophetie*, 130, and Berger, “Hellenistische Gattungen,” 1373, note 397.

²⁸⁷ Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 163-64.

²⁸⁸ See Kloppenborg, “Social History,” 90.

cities challenges a delusional sense of security and election which hinders those addressed from responding to the messengers. Verse 15 in particular inverts Capharnaum's pretension that it "will be exalted to heaven" into its opposite, "you shall be brought down to Hades," and impugns its elect status with an unfavorable comparison to proverbially reprobate Gentile cities.²⁸⁹ Thus 10:10-11 sets forth the fact that some Galilean towns reject the messengers, and 10:13-15 explains why this is so—because of the delusion that their elect status renders them immune to judgment.

It is at this point that the crucial, coordinating role of the saying, "I tell you, it shall be more tolerable on that day for Sodom than for that town" (10:12), emerges. Q scholarship is virtually unanimous that 10:12 functions as a transition between 10:4-11 (especially 10:10-11) and 10:13-15.²⁹⁰ The phrase τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ picks up the εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν from 10:8, 10, while the reference to the better fate of Sodom initiates the unfavorable comparison of the Galilean towns with proverbially bad Gentile cities.²⁹¹ The explicit reference to judgment in 10:12 and its use of comparative language are taken up robustly in 10:13-15. So in these respects 10:12 effects a transition in mood and motifs. The central saying(s) of the Eschatological Discourse, 13:30 and 14:11 ("the last shall be first and the first last..."), similarly invoke a judgment in which a reversal of normal expectations will occur.

Though opinion varies as to whether 10:12 is a traditional unit transmitted with the instructions 10:4-11 or a redactional attachment facilitating the appending of 10:13-15, it presents itself as a proverbial comparison saying whose reference to judgment gives it a strong prophetic flavor. Though the comparative phrase, "than for that town," establishes the connection of 10:12 to the preceding instructions, the Sodom saying is neither a generic part

²⁸⁹ See Wolfgang Schenk, "Die Verwünschung der Küstenorte Q 10,13-15: Zur Funktion der Konkreten Ortsangaben und zur Lokalisierung von Q," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, 477-90, esp. 486-87, and Risto Uro, "John the Baptist and the Jesus Movement: What Does Q Tell Us?" in *Gospel Behind the Gospels*, 231-57, esp. 242.

²⁹⁰ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.78, 83; Zeller, "Grundschrift," 390; idem, "Redactional Processes," 125; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 62; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 288, 303; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 199; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 286-87; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 148; Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 100.

²⁹¹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 196. See also Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 163, 173, note 28, and Sato, *Prophetic*, 38.

of the instructions nor is it a woe and thus assimilable to the woe oracle of 10:13.²⁹² As suggested it is a proverbial saying, in its present context best labeled an aphorism because the introductory λέγω ὑμῖν emphasizes the speaker and his authority, and the relatively higher status given Sodom subverts the conventional world-view of those who hear it.²⁹³ The fate of Sodom had very early achieved proverbial, archetypal status.²⁹⁴ Comparison with Sodom circulated widely as a universally accessible gnomic artifact that could be attached to any context in which a proverbial comparison with Sodom might be rhetorically appropriate.²⁹⁵

In 10:12 the idiosyncratic twist Q puts upon traditional wisdom again becomes apparent, for “to affirm that any town will fare *worse* than Sodom in the eschatological judgment is truly astonishing.”²⁹⁶ This crux unit of the Mission Instruction grants Sodom a higher status in judgment than the Galilean towns which reject the messengers. Thus the tendency of Q to locate a saying featuring a shift or even reversal in status in the center of its macro-compositions appears again in the Mission Instruction (compare 13:30; 14:11; 11:26c).

This unit also connects with the framework units, 9:57-60 and 10:21-22. In our discussion of those units we saw that they invoke

²⁹² See Sato, *Prophetic*, 38.

²⁹³ Edwards, *Theology*, 104, calls it “prophetic,” but acknowledges that “the wisdom influence is recognizable and the use of comparison.” Q 10:14 is structurally quite similar to 10:12 and likewise invokes Gentile cities whose infamy had won them proverbial status (see Ps 32:8, Isa 21; Jer 29; Ezek 16:44-56; 28:11-12, 22-23; Zech 9:2-4; Amos 1:9-10; 3:11 LXX; Joel 4:4-8; *1 Macc* 5:15), but it has been incorporated into the woe oracle 10:13-15.

²⁹⁴ See Ezek 16:56 (“a byword”).

²⁹⁵ Catchpole, “Mission Charge,” 164; Robert Alter, “Sodom as Nexus: the Web of Design in Biblical Narrative,” in *The Book and the Text: The Bible and Literary Theory*, ed. Regina M. Schwartz (Cambridge, Mass.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 146-60, esp. 157-58; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 275. The proverbial status of Sodom is invoked in Deut 29:23, Isa 1:19; 13:19, Jer 50:40, Ezek 14:44-56, Lam 4:11, Amos 4:11, *T. Isaac* 5:27, *3 Macc* 2:5, *Jub* 36:11, *T. Naph* 3:4; 4:1, and *T. Asher* 7:1. For a complete listing and discussion of passages see J. A. A. Loader, *A Tale of Two Cities. Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish and Early Christian Traditions*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 1 (Kampen: Kok, 1991).

²⁹⁶ Catchpole, “Mission Charge,” 164; see also Kloppenborg, “City and Wasteland,” 151, who notes in reference to *T. Isaac* 5:27 that “the inhabitants of Sodom are regularly remembered as being the worst of sinners, even occupying the lowest reaches of the abyss (*T. Isaac* 5:27),” and Schenk, *Synopse*, 55.

Son of Man motifs. Both in the tradition and in Q the Son of Man is the eschatological agent who executes judgment. Moreover the framework units feature the formation of the elect salvation community around the Son of Man and the Revealer, while the central unit delivers up the rejecting town to a judgment more horrific than Sodom's, setting up thereby a status contrast between election and dereliction.²⁹⁷

The fact that the saying makes explicit mention of Sodom corroborates the suspicion that the editor(s) responsible for the formation of the Mission Instruction drew upon the archetypal Sodom myth for inspiration and to establish cohesion amongst its diverse units. "In literary criticism myth means ultimately *mythos*, a structural organizing principle of literary form."²⁹⁸ Alter states, "As to the larger unfolding design of biblical literature, Sodom, firmly lodged between the enunciation of the covenantal promise and its fulfillment, becomes the great monitory model, the myth of a terrible collective destiny antithetical to Israel's. The biblical writers will rarely lose sight of the ghastly possibility that Israel can turn itself into Sodom."²⁹⁹ Implicit references to the Sodom narrative, easily recognizable to people inculturated within Israelite traditions, are sprinkled throughout this discourse.³⁰⁰ Divinely sent messengers traveling with urgency to towns are central to both the Mission Instruction and the Sodom narrative, as is the description of their hospitable and inhospitable reception.³⁰¹ Like the Sodom narrative the Mission Instruction

²⁹⁷ Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom," 78-79, notes that in *I Enoch*, revealed wisdom is reserved to the elect, but rejected by outsiders, who are then punished "for their rejection of divine wisdom..." (see *Wis* 10:6-9, accusing the inhabitants of Sodom of rejecting Wisdom). Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 99-100, notes the soteriological function of the revelation of 10:21-22.

²⁹⁸ Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 341.

²⁹⁹ Alter, "Sodom as Nexus," 157. Alter also offers a brief analysis of the Gibeah story in Judges 19: "As we might expect, the writer has drawn from the Sodom story not only the grisly plot but also its principal thematic ramifications. The Gibeah story, like that of Sodom, is prefaced by two hospitality episodes....The depravity of the town results in its destruction...."

³⁰⁰ Noted by Loader, *Sodom and Gomorrah*, 118. Kloppenborg, "City and Wasteland," 152, states that "the story of Sodom looms large in the architecture of Q...."

³⁰¹ T. Desmond Alexander, "Lot's Hospitality: A Clue to His Righteousness," *JBL* 104 (1985) 289-91; Schenk, *Synopse*, 55; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 275. Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 164, cites *T. Asher* 7:1: "Do not become like Sodom, which did not recognize the Lord's angels and perished for ever."

has the messengers abandon the rejecting city (10:11), followed by what amounts to the virtual depiction of the judgment itself (10:12, 13-15). Placing an explicit reference to Sodom in the heart of the discourse supplies the clue that the composition is indeed to be read in the light of the Sodom myth and demonstrates the function of the central saying to act as a hermeneutical key for the diverse elements of the composition.³⁰²

Verse 12 depicts an exchange of positions, or reversal of expectations, with respect to the proverbially corrupt Sodom and rejecting Galilean cities. It thus expresses aphoristically the reversal of status thematized in the other units. It is the cities so confident of their exalted elect status which are threatened with judgment (10:11) and downfall to Hades (10:15). In 10:13-15 Galilean towns exchange places with the neighboring Gentile cities Tyre and Sidon and thus move from high to low status. The framework units, viewed together, depict a rise in status and in combination with 10:12 express the fundamental argument of Q: the last shall be first and the first shall be last. Both the demeanor adopted by the lowly Son of Man—homelessness, vagrancy—in 9:57-58, and the actions he demands of those who would follow him—ignoring fundamental social obligations—strike at the heart of the conventional system of honor and respectable behavior. The behavior and appearance of Jesus and his followers mark them as poor (in effect, beggars) and, viewed from the perspective of conventional wisdom, deviant and shameful.³⁰³ By holding up his vagrant lifestyle as an exemplar and asking his followers to emulate it, Jesus requires them to adopt the low status and accompanying shame to which his behavior, demeanor, and poverty consign him.³⁰⁴ In 10:21-22, however, the low status of

³⁰² The destruction of Sodom appears as the central unit in the sequence of the narrative which runs from Gen 17 to 21 (Alter, "Sodom as Nexus," 157-160; Loader, *Sodom and Gomorrah*, 15-16).

³⁰³ For the shame and disapprobation which would attend a son's refusal to bury his father see Vaage, *Upstarts*, 92-93, who cites Sir 44:14; 46:12; 49:10, and Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 8-12. Q 10:2-11 continues this depiction of Jesus' followers as those who adopt a posture conventionally considered shameful and characteristic of those of low status: they do not work for a living, they give the appearance of being vagrant, they do not wear shoes. See also Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 169, Moxnes, *Economy of the Kingdom*, 91-92, and Kloppenborg, "Alms, Debt, and Divorce," 187.

³⁰⁴ See Malina and Neyrey, "Honor and Shame," 40.

Jesus and his followers is converted to high status, and their shame to honor. Jesus wanders, a vagrant in the eyes of normative society, homeless and unconnected with property or a conventional kinship group. But 10:21-22 ascribes the highest possible honor to Jesus, asserting that God, the Lord of creation, is his father.³⁰⁵ The disciple renounces the normative structures of family by neglecting the social duty of burying one's father, the fulfillment of which promotes inter-generational social continuity. But in 10:21-22 the follower is incorporated into a kinship group to which God stands in a paternal relationship.³⁰⁶ Jesus' followers acquire "goods" to compensate for the forfeiture of whatever patrimony would have accrued to them upon the burial of the father, for Jesus has "all things" handed over to him by his father, the Lord of creation, and his followers are now part of his kinship group. Moreover, "Weisheit und gehobener Sozialstatus gehören eng zusammen,"³⁰⁷ and 10:21-22 ascribes privileged knowledge to this group of social deviants. In short, the framework units of the Mission Instruction inscribe the change of status by which those who are "last" in terms of honor and status become the "first."³⁰⁸

The movement in the opposite direction, from honor to shame, from high to low status, takes place in the main body of the composition and is epitomized by 10:12. In 10:12 rejecting towns are shamed through consignment to a status lower than that of the most wicked of wicked Gentile cities, Sodom.³⁰⁹ The woes then place the rejecting towns in the lowest possible spot—Hades.

³⁰⁵ See Malina and Neyrey, "Honor and Shame, 47, on ascribed honor.

³⁰⁶ A similar rhetorical strategy is evident in Hebrews; see David A. deSilva, "Despising Shame: A Cultural-Anthropological Investigation of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JBL* 113 (1994) 439-61, esp. 457.

³⁰⁷ Theissen, "Wertrevolution," 353.

³⁰⁸ Ebertz, *Charisma*, 237, argues that 10:21-22 is carrying out a program of "de-stigmatization." The social phenomenon of a stigmatized, deviant group redefining itself as an elect group is described by Berger & Luckmann, *Social Construction*, 166-67. Referring to the tension typically arising between critics from "normative society" and adherents of "new religious movements" Hexham and Poewe state, "The former contend that primal experiences are evidence of deviance, whereas the latter contend that they constitute privileged communication" (Irving Hexham and Karla Poewe, *New Religions as Global Cultures: Making the Human Sacred* [Boulder: Westview, 1997], 133).

³⁰⁹ See Jonathan Reed, "The Social Map of Q" in *Conflict and Invention*, 18-41, esp. 25, and Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 172.

God will respond to the dishonoring of his messengers—which entails his dishonor—by judging those who reject them.³¹⁰

Thus the Mission Instruction enacts an agonistic drama, a struggle for the limited commodity of honor.³¹¹ It executes a precise honor-shame calculus: honor and corresponding status positions are challenged, lost, regained, and exchanged down the length of the Discourse, with Jesus and his followers emerging as winners. Though the central aphorism refers explicitly only to the status-degradation of the rejecting cities, within the agonistic configuration of the speech their loss of status entails rise in status for the messengers. The central saying is the crux in this shift of status, for it announces judgment, the actual mechanism by which the change is brought about.³¹² In a similar manner the central instructional speech of the Eschatological Discourse features a “Gerichtsdialog” (13:26-27) which supplies the mechanism effecting the crux reversal of status (13:30; 14:11).

Finally, how can a speech incorporating a number of prophetic motifs (call, commissioning, proclamation, symbolic actions, rejection and mistreatment, antagonistic stance vis à vis recalcitrant cities, threats of judgment, woes, repentance) by any stretch of the imagination be designated a wisdom composition?³¹³ If one prescind from merely tallying up themes and considers genre conventions, it emerges quite quickly that the Mission Instruction has much more in common with sapiential speech, and in this regard actually bears very little resemblance to prophecy at all. We have already seen that 10:4-11 is a messenger instruction incorporating sapiential topoi which deal with equipping, provisioning, hospitality, and comportment at table.³¹⁴ With the

³¹⁰ Malina and Neyrey, “Honor and Shame,” 59-60; see also DeSilva, “Despising Shame,” 452.

³¹¹ See Kloppenborg, “Alms, Debt and Divorce,” 188, and Foster, “Limited Good,” 296-97, 300-301.

³¹² As is the case with the middle unit of the first section of the *Wisdom of Solomon*, which thematizes judgment on the wicked. See *Wis* 3:7-8, 10, 18-19; 4:4-5, 16, 18-19.

³¹³ Pointing out the prophetic and/or apocalyptic affinities of this speech are Horsley, “Logoi Propheton?” 205, Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 68, 137, 144, Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 349-50, Edwards, *Theology*, 103, von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 210, 213-14, Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.65, Schenk, *Synopse*, 49, and Sato, *Prophetie*, 198.

³¹⁴ On equipment instructions see Kloppenborg, “The Formation of Q Revisited: A Response to Richard Horsley,” in *SBLSP* 28, ed. David Lull (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 204-15, esp. 210.

addition of 10:2-3, which adduce opening maxims and programmatic admonitions, these verses continue to conform to the conventions of instructional speech. We also saw that the "harvest" motif makes the instruction an exemplar of the gnomological topos dealing with work and the relationship between work and provisioning.³¹⁵ Like the smaller instructional speeches, the Mission Instruction revolves around a coordinating saying. The opening unit consists of two chreias, a form commonly used in instructional settings in the Hellenistic world; indeed, Robbins points out that structure of 9:57-60 conforms to the conventional opening of a chreia elaboration.³¹⁶ Moreover, Jesus' pithy response to the inquirer has maxim-like properties.³¹⁷ Hence the speech opens, like many instructions, with a maxim followed by an admonition ("Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead") which is itself aphoristic.³¹⁸ Moreover, the two opening chreias strike themes fundamental to the instructions which follow, and thus function programmatically for the rest of the speech, just as 10:23-24 and 12:2 were seen to do for their respective discourses.³¹⁹

The announcement of judgment in 10:13-15 as well as the hymnic thanksgiving in 10:21 appear to present anomalies for a sapiential speech. Q 10:13-15 can certainly be classified as "prophetischen Drohrede."³²⁰ As was seen in our analysis of the announce-

³¹⁵ Derron, *Sentences*, xxvi-xxvii, lists *περὶ ἐργασίας* as one of "les thèmes fondamentaux de toute gnomologie."

³¹⁶ Robbins, "Foxes, Birds," 74.

³¹⁷ Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 7; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 205; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 192; Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 9. Schenk, *Synopse*, 49, designates it a dominical aphorism. Winton, *Proverbs of Jesus*, 48, calls it "proverbial in form," but is reluctant to designate it a proverb because the specific reference to the Son of Man deprives it of its status as a general observation about humanity. Zeller, "Grundschrift," 391, uses the specificity of its reference to the Son of Man to deny that it has any wisdom character at all, but offers no alternative form-critical classification.

³¹⁸ Löning, "Füchse," 90, refers to the "weisheitliche Prägung" of this threshold unit.

³¹⁹ Löning, "Füchse," 83, 93-94; Kloppenborg, "Antique Instructional Genres," 151. See also Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 192, Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 54, Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.38, Schenk, *Synopse*, 49, Sato, *Prophetie*, 37, and Christopher M. Tuckett, "On the Stratification of Q: A Response," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 213-22, esp. 220-21.

³²⁰ Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 275. Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 205, further specifies the genre of 10:13-15 as "Weherufen gegen Städte und Landschaften," and

ment of judgment in the Controversy Discourse (11:39-48, 52, 49-51), however, a sapiential framework genre can incorporate prophetic genres, and a fairly precise analogy to the insertion of woes in Q 11 was found in the instruction of *Sir* 2:1-17 (especially verses 12-14). The *Sirach* instruction works equally well as a comparative compositional model for the woes in Q 10:13-15: motif-connections with the surrounding instructional material;³²¹ shift from an instructional mode of speech to the threatening tone of woes, including a specific threat of judgment in 2:14b;³²² shift to direct address to a group or entity which stands opposed to the deliberative concerns of the instruction; a shift back to instructional address (2:15-17; compare Q 10:16).³²³ Another exam-

cites *Sib* III (303, 499f., 504, 508, 512); (v. 143f.); V (168ff., 317); 5 *Ezra* 15:46ff.; Qoh 10:16; Ezek 24; Jer 13:27; 48:1; 28:2; 50:27; Num 21:29.

³²¹ Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 152, notes that "the Gr verb *pisteuei*, 'trust,' in v. 13a, is a catchword connecting this stanza with the preceding stanzas; cf. vv 6a, 8a, 10b."

³²² Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 152.

³²³ It is possible to see 10:13-15 as a threat of divine sanction which functions as motivation for those addressed to conform to the message. Alternatively, it may function similarly to the woes in 1 *Enoch* 92-105. Schenk, "Verwünschung," 478-79, states with regard to the *Enoch* woes, "Dabei sind die Betroffenen [the addressees of the woes] als fiktive Adressaten nur ein 'Zweitpublikum', während primäre Adressaten des Briefes die zur tröstenden toratreuen Gerechten/Weisen (98,9; 99,2.14) und von den Falschlehren (98,15) Unterdrückten sind...." He states, "Dasselbe gilt textpragmatisch auch für Q 10,13-15, wo die Städte gegenüber den angeredeten Boten 10,2-12,16 deutlich ein Zweitpublikum darstellen...." Schenk is arguing, in effect, that the shift to the woes entails no true change in audience. The Mission Instruction may be polyvalent in this regard. Clearly it functions to instruct itinerants, but one can also see it functioning protreptically with respect to outsiders. In the former case the woes would be an encouragement to the itinerants to persevere despite opposition (so Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 189) and a compensatory rationale for separating themselves from the norms of society (compare Q 12:10); in the latter case they would goad recalcitrant outsiders into joining the elect community in order to escape judgment. In this latter regard, Quintilian (III.viii.39), states (speaking of deliberative rhetoric): "The minds of such an audience are not to be moved by discoursing on the nature of virtue, which they ignore, but by praise, by appeals to popular opinion, and if such vanities are of no avail, by demonstration of the advantage that will accrue from such a policy, or more effectively perhaps *by pointing out the appalling consequences that will follow the opposite policy* [my emphasis]." Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 206, also takes the Q woes to be symbuleutic devices. To be sure, the woes are retrospective in comparison to the instructions, but in this respect within the sequence merely point to the course of the mission. Similar "implied narrative" movement, similarly coordinated with a darkening of mood, can be detected in the other discourses.

ple is *Sir* 41:8-9, a woe inserted into a row of proverbs dealing with the theme "children of the ungodly" (41:5-7, 10). Like Q 10:13-15, it shifts to direct address (from third person speech), names the ungodly, their sin, a heavy sanction, and is appropriate to the instructional concerns of its context.

In light of this, the announcement of judgment in Q 10:13-15 can be classified rhetorically as an *apostrophe*.³²⁴ Carruth defines apostrophe as "turning away from the normal audience to address another."³²⁵ The *Ad Herennium* IV.xv.22 describes the apostrophe as "the figure which expresses grief or indignation by means of an address to some man or city or place or object....If we use Apostrophe in its proper place, sparingly, and when the importance of the subject seems to demand it, we shall instill in the hearer as much indignation as we desire." Quintilian describes apostrophe as follows:

Apostrophe also, which consists in the diversion of our address from the judge, is wonderfully stirring, whether we attack our adversary as in the passage, 'What was that sword of yours doing, Tubero, in the field of Pharsalus?' [*pro Lig.* iii.9] or turn to make some invocation such as, 'For I appeal to you, hills and groves of Alba,' [*pro Mil.* xxxi.85] or to entreaty that will bring odium on our opponents, as in the cry, 'O Porcian and Sempronian laws' [*Verr.* v.lxxiii.163] (IX.ii.38-39).

He continues,

These figures and the like, which consist in change, addition, omission, and the order of words, serve to attract the attention of the audience and do not allow it to flag, rousing it from time to time by some specially rousing figure, while they derive something of their charm from their very resemblance to blemishes, just as a trace of bitterness in food will sometimes tickle the palate (IX.iii.26-27).

Aristotle describes how Isocrates, even in the midst of deliberative or epideictic speeches, "brings accusations against the Lacedaemonians, for instance, in the *Panegyricus* [110-114] and against

³²⁴ Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 142, also makes reference to the technique of *variatio*, which "als Gesamterscheinung der Rhetorik wirkt dem *taedium* (s. § 269) des Publikums entgegen durch Abwechslung in Gedankenführung...und sprachlichem Ausdruck."

³²⁵ Carruth, "Persuasion," 137.

Chares in the *Symmachikos* (on the Peace) [27]" (*Ars Rhetorica* III.17.10). *Ps.-Phoc.* 42-48 contains an apostrophe: "The love of money is the mother of every evil. Gold and silver are always a delusion for people. 'Gold, you cause of evils, destroyer of life, crushing everything...'"³²⁶ Hence it is possible account for the presence of 10:13-15 from two perspectives: from the tendency of instructional speeches to incorporate divine sanctions, and from its affinities with the rhetorical figure of the apostrophe. Resort to a redaction history is unnecessary in this case, though tradition-history analyses lose none of their importance.

The case is similar for the hymnic thanksgiving and revelation unit in 10:21-22. Hymnic thanksgivings occur with some frequency in wisdom literature. Gammie states, "Praises (poems of praise, hymns of praise) or encomia...are also a recurring and often *framing* sub-genre of Paraenetic Literature" (my emphasis).³²⁷ A hymnic self-description of Wisdom in which she describes her special relationship to God, her role as Revelatrice (specifically, through the Torah), and her appearance on earth among an "honored people" (verse 12) occurs in *Sir* 24, like Q 10:21-22, 23-24 the middle of the book.³²⁸ Moreover, Q 10:21-22 is replete with wisdom motifs.³²⁹ The fact that a literary unit characterized by such climaxes the Mission Instruction indicates that the

³²⁶ Another analogy is offered by *Amenemope* chapter 2. Kayatz, *Studien*, 57, analyzes it as follows: "Das Thema wird in vier konkreten Einzelmahnungen entfaltet, denen noch ein besonderer Fall mit kasuistischer Einleitung angefügt wird. In der Begründung werden die verwehrten Handlungsweisen zusammengefaßt und als 'Böses tun' verurteilt. In bilderreicher dichterischer Sprache wird das Ergehen dessen, der Böses tut, geschildert. Diese Begründung wird unterbrochen durch einen Personenwechsel, mit einer innerhalb der Begründung ungewöhnlichen direkten Anrede: 'Du Heißer, wie bist du dann?' Dadurch wird eine besondere persönliche Unmittelbarkeit und Dringlichkeit erreicht."

³²⁷ Gammie, "Morphology," 62, (citing *Sir* 1:1-20; 24; 51:13-10; 51:1-12; Prov 3:13-18; 8:32-36; 31:10-31; *Wis* 6:12-12:2; 19:22; *Sir* 4:11-19; 16:24-17:14; 18:1-14; 39:12-35; 42:15-43:23). Baumgartner, "Literarische Gattungen," 178, designates *Sir* 51:1-12 a "Danklied. For hymnic elements in Egyptian Instructions see Kayatz, *Studien*, 51. *Golden Verses* 61-62 consists of a short prayer to "Father Zeus" and a request for revelation.

³²⁸ Gammie, "Morphology," 62. Kayatz, *Studien*, 50, describes Prov 3:13-20 as "eine Prädikation der Weisheit in hymnischem Stil." Further, she states that "das Vorkommen dieses hymnischen Preisliedes auf die Weisheit ist in ihrer zentralen Stellung in unserer Sammlung begründet." Prov 3:13-20 describes both Wisdom and the blessedness of those who receive her.

³²⁹ Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 26-27.

mission was understood in terms of the acquisition of revealed wisdom, regardless of the extent to which features of the prophetic vocation are invoked to describe the call, commissioning, and activities of the messengers.³³⁰ When viewed in this light, the Mission Instruction takes on aspects of a protreptic speech, with parallels in Greco-Roman philosophical schools, with its call to a new vocation by an authoritative personality claiming access to divine wisdom and promising wisdom to those who accept the calling.³³¹

However, the Mission Instruction presents an inversion, or a burlesque, of conventional wisdom. Traditional paraenesis would urge fulfillment of social obligations and would cast opprobrium upon those who were vagrant, did not work for a living, violated conventional dress codes, and depended upon the largesse of others.³³² Q parodies this traditional wisdom by invoking the traditional instructional topoi to present its alternative view of appropriate behavior. However, this is not cultivation of an alternative lifestyle merely to display disdain for convention. Rather Jesus and the group around him engage in a mission issuing from a sense of crisis. God is about to intervene in judgment to establish his Kingdom. Accordingly, the present system is viewed as having run its course. The admonition of 9:60, "Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead," declares invalid the social ritual—a son's burial of his father and corresponding succession to his position—especially concerned with inter-generational continuity and maintenance of the social order in its cur-

³³⁰ *Wis* 10:6-8 describes the fate of the men of Sodom as being the consequence of their rejection of Wisdom. Wisdom or her envoys could be depicted in prophetic terms. See *Sir* 24:33-34 and *Wis* 7:27; 11:1. *Prov* 1:21-33 presents Wisdom in the garb of a prophetess making an appeal for followers "at the entrance of the city gates" (1:21) and issuing an announcement of judgment against those who reject her. On this see Roland E. Murphy, "Wisdom's Song: Proverbs 1:20-33," *CBQ* 48 (1986) 456-60, Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos*, 4, 20-21 ("...die Einladung der Weisheit schlägt sehr bald (vgl. V. 24) in eine Drohung gegen die Ungehorsamen..." [4]), Kayatz, *Studien*, 120-24, 27, Baumgartner, "Literarische Gattungen," 196, and Bernhard Lang, *Wisdom and the Book of Proverbs*, 20, 29, 41-48.

³³¹ See Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 27-33. Wilson, *Mysteries*, 150, 167, 199, points out that in Hellenistic moral philosophy, cultivation of virtue "relied upon the special insight that comes through divine revelation" (199); thus the emphasis upon *φαινεῖν* in *Ps.-Phoc.* 1-2, and on the sage as revelator.

³³² Moxnes, *Economy of the Kingdom*, 91; Malina and Neyrey, *Calling*, 22.

rent configurations.³³³ Jesus' repudiation of this ritual amounts to a declaration that society as it is currently configured has no future; God's Kingdom is breaking in and with it new social realities. Moreover, the harvest motif invoked in 10:2 has a history as a symbol of the eschatological judgment of God.³³⁴ Adducing it in connection with commissioning of messengers to announce the arrival of the Kingdom corroborates the suspicion that it is used so here. Work *per se* is not being repudiated by Jesus and the messengers; rather, in light of the crisis of the times traditional concepts of agricultural endeavor, predicated upon eternal recurrence of the seasons, are rendered irrelevant. A new labor, a new harvest, one appropriate to the times, presents itself. The haste of the messengers may itself be a sign of the urgency connected with crisis. These oblique indicators of Q's perspective receive explicit expression in 10:9b: "The kingdom of God has come near to you." The speech presents the kingdom in its twin aspects of restoration (10:9a) and judgment (10:10-11, 12, 13-15).³³⁵ Hence the wisdom of the Mission Instruction, like that of the other discourses, is generated both by opposition to the current state of affairs and the corresponding conviction that the present is a time of crisis in which "the kingdom of God has come near."

Inaugural Discourse (Q 3:7-9, 16-17, 21-22; 4:1-13; 6:20b-49; 7:1-10, 18-35)

Robinson states of the Inaugural Discourse: "The first third of Q seems to have an enveloping form: It begins and ends with discussion of John and Jesus, into which is tucked the definitive witness to Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος in the Inaugural Sermon and the Healing of the Centurion's Boy."³³⁶ Though Robinson takes the Sermon (6:20b-49) to be a pre-existing sayings collection,³³⁷

³³³ Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 375-80.

³³⁴ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 411; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 290; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 60; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 137; Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 188; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 192; Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 154.

³³⁵ Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 188, drawing the comparison with Q 3:16-17.

³³⁶ James M. Robinson, "Sayings Gospel," 365-66. Robinson makes the Temptation a later interpolation (362).

³³⁷ Robinson, "LOGOI SOPHON," 94-95. See also idem, "Early Collections," 391-92.

he argues that special efforts were made to link its motifs with the framework materials, visible in the manner in which 7:22, with its reference to healings and preaching good news to the poor, chiasmatically recapitulates the themes of 6:20-21 and 7:1-10. Moreover, 7:22 confirms the characterization of Jesus as the "Coming One" announced by John in 3:16-17.³³⁸

Sevenich-Bax, utilizing text-linguistic analytical categories such as lexical, form-critical, and semantic recurrence and hierarchies of speech acts to delineate literary units and to establish their compositional relationships, posits a concentrically structured macro composition. The Sermon (6:20b-49) constitutes the center, around which the Temptation and the healing story form an inner framework featuring paradigmatic exemplars of key virtues, in turn framed by the John materials in Q 3 and Q 7.³³⁹ Sevenich-Bax shows from a text-linguistic perspective the compositional coherence of the entire Discourse in a manner which also integrates the Temptation structurally and rhetorically (functioning as paradigm) into the Discourse. This presents an important challenge to analyses which posit a fissured text replete with alleged disjunctions and tensions which enable readings of redaction histories. Sevenich-Bax states, "Das Gebilde stellt vielmehr eine *bis in die Einzelheiten* theologische durchdachte, bewußte komponierte und reflektierte Einheit dar" (my emphasis).³⁴⁰

We shall argue, similarly to Sevenich-Bax, that the disparate traditions of the Inaugural Discourse are arranged in a manner approximating the macro arrangements already observed in the Mission Instruction, the Controversy Discourse, and the Eschatological Discourse. Its configuration can be represented as follows:

A. John introduces Jesus (3:7-9, 16-17, 21-22)

- a. John's ministry: preaching the coming wrath (τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς) and imminent judgment to γεννήματα ἔχιδνῶν (3:7-9)
Concludes with a threat of judgment (3:9)
- b. John describes the Coming One (3:16-17)

³³⁸ Robinson, "Sayings Gospel," 365.

³³⁹ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 267.

³⁴⁰ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 462.

John speaks prospectively about Jesus (ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος)
 John's baptism preparatory to the Coming One
 John's lowliness with respect to the Coming One (ἰσχυρότερος;
 John not fit to remove sandals) (3:16)
 The Coming One's work (3:17)

- c. Jesus and John together at baptism (3:21-22)
 Spirit of God/Holy Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα θεοῦ/ἅγιον)
 "my beloved son" (ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός)

B. Temptation Narrative (4:1-13)
 Speech in narrative framework

C. Inaugural Sermon (6:20b-49)
 Macarisms (6:20-23)
 Love Enemies Instruction (6:27-35, 36)
 Judge Not Instruction (6:37-42)

Central Saying: *A disciple is not above his teacher, but everyone, when well trained, will be like his teacher* (6:40).
 Trees, Fruit, Speech Instruction (6:43-45)
 Parable of Two Builders (6:46-49)

B' Healing of the Centurion's Child (7:1-10)
 Speech in narrative framework

A' Jesus speaks of John (7:18-35)

- a' Jesus' ministry: healing, preaching good news (εὐαγγελίζονται)
 to the poor (πτωχοί) (7:22)
 John absent
 Concludes with a macarism (7:23)
- b' Jesus describes John (7:24-28)
 Jesus speaks retrospectively about John (7:24-28)
 John more than a prophet (περισσότερον) who prepares the way
 (ἔμπροσθέν σου) (7:27)
 John's work (7:27)
 John's lowliness with respect to least in the Kingdom (μείζων
 Ἰωάννου, ὁ δὲ μικρότερος...μείζων αὐτοῦ) (7:28)
- c' John and Jesus viewed together (7:31-35)
 Son of Man (υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου)
 Wisdom (ἡ σοφία)

As was the case with the other discourses, this macro composition is built up out of the discrete literary units which constitute it. The linear sequentialization of the constituent units works out an aggressive rhetorical strategy whose focus, we shall see, is *legitimation, establishing the ethos of the sage, and recruitment*.

It is easy to be put off by the proposed ring format, particularly since it entails that the Inaugural Discourse display unusual complexity in its outer framework units, each of which is constituted by three smaller literary units. Two things should be kept in mind, however. First, there is already wide agreement in Q scholarship as regards the existence of a respectively tripartite John/Jesus framework (with some questions about the status of 3:21-22) around the Sermon. Second, we shall see that this complexity arises from the fact that the framework executes a *synkrisis* of John and Jesus which views them from different perspectives; that is, *the text arrangement in this case coheres quite closely with the project carried out by the operative genre*. The evidence for this arrangement will be discussed at greater length below; for the present we shall proceed by establishing that each framework section is indeed made up of three self-contained literary units, and then move to analysis of the *synkrisis* itself.

Q 3:7-9: The opening unit is framed as a circumstantial chreia in which John addresses the crowds in a confrontational manner, probably a mixed group of curious spectators and those seeking baptism.³⁴¹ Like many chreias it has a disorienting function, for it challenges the audience's self-assured but deluded worldview by aggressively questioning its basic self-understanding as being God's elect covenant people and thus immune from judgment. Q scholarship has typically characterized 3:7-9 as prophetic speech and polemic, and indeed John appears very prophetic-like and prophetic intensity and motifs animate his speech. However, from a form-critical perspective the speech is actually paraenetic: chreia; scolding word (*Scheltwort*); double admonition followed by two motive clauses invoking a conditional threat of

³⁴¹ Kloppenborg, "City and Wasteland," 149; similarly Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 369-70. Kloppenborg points out that John's name was probably mentioned in 3:7a "since Matthew and Luke agree in placing 3:7b-9, 16b-17 on John's lips...."

judgment.³⁴² The admonition against complacent reliance upon election is grounded with an aphoristic motive clause (3:8c). “Offspring of vipers” (3:7b) anticipates the puncturing of confidence in Abrahamic descent (3:8bc). The composition is concluded by a maxim (3:9b) which with its references to both judgment and fruit forms a cumulative inclusio.³⁴³

Berger draws attention to a similar pattern consisting of “*Schelte, Mahnung und bedingter Unheilsankündigung*” which recurs in the paraenesis to the churches in Rev 1-3. Berger also cites *Pseudo-Philo* 22:5-6: “*Schelte: Warum...nicht? Es folgt ein exemplum. Mahnung: Geht jetzt hin...Schluß: Doppelteilige bedingte Heils - und Unheilsankündigung.*”³⁴⁴ In view of these form-critical observations, it is difficult to follow the opinion of some scholars that elements of this speech—usually verse 8 or parts thereof—are intrusive.³⁴⁵ One can imagine a primitive chreia which has been expanded, as Uro suggests, but none of its present elements are either compositionally or thematically intrusive.

Q 3:16-17: The opening unit and 3:16-17 should be viewed together under the rubric “John’s preaching.”³⁴⁶ The keyword $\pi\upsilon\phi$ links both units. Both units invoke judgment as a motivation, in 3:16-17 in the form of a coming figure of judgment.³⁴⁷ In 3:7-9 the threat of judgment supports the admonition to decisive moral action, in 3:16-17 to submit to John’s water baptism of repentance before judgment falls.³⁴⁸ Like 3:7-9, 3:16-17 subverts conventional notions of election by inverting the common view that “wheat” represents Israel and “chaff” the nations.³⁴⁹

³⁴² For a discussion of the form-critical contours of 3:7-9 see Sato, *Prophetie*, 202-12. On the genre *Scheltwort* see Markert, *Struktur und Bezeichnung*, 261.

³⁴³ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 27. See also Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 283.

³⁴⁴ Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 195. See also Hoffmann, *Studien*, 26, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 103-104, and Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 369-70.

³⁴⁵ Uro, “John the Baptist,” 244, because it allegedly interrupts the flow of thought; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 82, who takes all of 3:8 to be intrusive because it supposedly interrupts the announcement of judgment formed by 3:7, 9.

³⁴⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 102. See also William Arnal, “Redactional Fabrication and Group Legitimation: The Baptist’s Preaching in Q (3:7-9, 16-17),” in *Conflict and Invention*, 165-180, esp. 174.

³⁴⁷ Schenk, *Synopse*, 19; Sato, *Prophetie*, 127.

³⁴⁸ See Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.83, Hoffmann, *Studien*, 28, and Sato, *Prophetie*, 128.

³⁴⁹ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 31; Sato, *Prophetie*, 129. Hoffmann cites Tractate Nida 31a; Midrash to Canticles 7.3.

Both units terminate in an agricultural *Bildwort* depicting the saved and those who perish in fire. Despite the affinities of the two units, 3:16-17 is a self-contained composition focused on characterizing the Coming One and bound together by the anaphoric pronoun *ov̄*.³⁵⁰ Attention shifts from repentance preaching in 3:7-9 to John's announcement of the coming judge in 3:16-17 and to a description of this figure cast in part as a comparison with John.³⁵¹ John presents his baptism as the means of escaping that judgment and of selecting out a group which will experience salvation at the coming of one "who will effect both fiery judgment and salvation of the elect."³⁵²

Q 3:21-22: Here we follow the IQP decision that 3:21-22 belongs in Q, while acknowledging that precise reconstruction is impossible.³⁵³ Robinson argues that the devil's challenge to the "son of God" title in the Temptation implies some previous identification of Jesus with that title, and Catchpole points to a parallel sequence of (1) naming as God's son, followed by (2) challenge by the wicked in *Wis* 2:16-18.³⁵⁴ Both 3:16-17 and 3:21-22 introduce a title for Jesus, Coming One and son of God respectively, each of which is then challenged: the son of God in 4:1-13 by the devil, and the Coming One in 7:18-23 by John himself (here we see the emerging contours of a linear elaboration). Moreover 3:21-22 is an honor-ascription which gives legitimacy to Jesus' exalted self-recommendation in Q 10:21-22.³⁵⁵

³⁵⁰ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 283.

³⁵¹ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 2.183; similarly Uro, "John the Baptist," 243-44. See also Zeller, *Kommentar*, 20, Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 376, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 102-103, Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 98, and Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 280, who notes the contrast of confrontive and comparative language which distinguishes the units.

³⁵² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 103; see also Sato, *Prophetie*, 127.

³⁵³ See Sterling Bjorndahl, "Database and Evaluation of Q 3:21-22," *Documenta Q*, 1-20, esp. 7-8, 19-20, typescript. Kloppenborg argues that the agreements are not sufficient to warrant positing double tradition (*Formation*, 84-85, note 157; idem, *Q Parallels*, 16); similarly Franz Neirynck, "The Minor Agreements and Q," in *Gospel Behind the Gospels*, 49-72, esp. 65-67.

³⁵⁴ James M. Robinson, "The Q Trajectory: Between John and Matthew via Jesus," in *Future of Early Christianity*, 173-94, esp. 190-91, note 49; idem, "Sayings Gospel," 384; David R. Catchpole, "The Beginning of Q: A Proposal," *NTS* 38 (1992) 205-21, esp. 206-207.

³⁵⁵ Malina and Neyrey, "Honor and Shame," 48; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 316-17.

Most commentators view the inter-related material in Q 7:18-35 as constituted by three literary units: 7:18-23, 24-28, 31-35.³⁵⁶

Q 7:18-23: Form-critically 7:18-23 is a chreia which combines wisdom and prophetic motifs.³⁵⁷ On the one hand it announces that the present is the joyful time of fulfillment by applying Isaianic descriptions of that time to Jesus' ministry.³⁵⁸ On the other hand the chreia is a Hellenistic instructional genre and is used here as elsewhere to challenge and revise preconceived notions and questionable opinions.³⁵⁹ In this case it concludes with a macarism which in chreiaic fashion counters John's opening question with a challenge to reconsider the premises and stereotypes which generated it.³⁶⁰

Despite some sophisticated efforts to stratify 7:18-23, it was probably from the start an integrated Q composition, regardless of the tradition history of its constituent elements.³⁶¹ In its present form it approximates to a mixed chreia by virtue of its reference to significant actions coupled with a shrewd aphoristic

³⁵⁶ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 25; see also Steinhauser, *Doppelbildworte*, 170, Zeller, *Kommentar*, 39, Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 263, 333, 347, and Ron Cameron, "Characterizations," 35-69. This is not to say that the material is free from tradition-history fissures; see Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 115, Tuckett, "Mark and Q," 166-67, Schürmann, "Zeugnis," 140-42, Zeller, *Kommentar*, 95, and Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 114. Cameron tries to cast 7:18-35 in its entirety as an elaborated chreia commenting on the cryptic 7:23; however, Cameron's proposal must suppress the form-critical attributes of the units in order to apply the chreia-elaboration model. Q 7:18-35 is made up of at least two chreias, 7:18-23, 7:24-28. Forcing elements of 7:24-28 and 7:31-35 to look back rhetorically and elaboratively to the putative "rationale," 7:23, diverts attention from their true rhetorical function within their own units. It is preferable to see three rhetorically autonomous yet interlinked units, each of which is capped by a surprising and enigmatic saying, each of which revises preconceived notions of identity ("Characterizations," 55).

³⁵⁷ Cameron, "Characterizations," 46, 53; Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 123; Bultmann, *History*, 23.

³⁵⁸ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 25; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.411; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 239; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 205. Sato, *Prophetie*, 142, lists Isa 29:18f; 35:5f; 42:7; 61:1; 2 Kings 5, and 1 Kings 17:17-24, as alluded to in 7:22. Similar expectations for the end time which Sato notes appear in *Jub* 1:29; 23:30; *1 Enoch* 96:3; *Syr. Bar.* 29:7; 73:2.

³⁵⁹ Cameron, "Characterizations," 55.

³⁶⁰ Cameron, "Characterizations," 52.

³⁶¹ Cameron, "Characterizations," 51-53, argues that 7:19, 23 formed a primitive chreia later expanded by 7:22. Cameron follows the older form-critical practice of privileging an archetypal form—in this case a chreia consisting of

conclusion. Both 7:22 and 7:23 challenge John's conception of the Coming One which provoked his question.³⁶² Moreover, as some scholars have pointed out, each element of 7:18-23 is linked to some preceding pericope or saying in the Inaugural Discourse. John and the "Coming One" are drawn from 3:7-9, 16-17; the healings and preaching to the poor listed in that order in 7:22 correspond chiastically to the healing of the Centurion's Child (7:1-10) and the beatitude incipit of the Inaugural Sermon, which is explicitly directed to the poor (6:20-21). As if to make the retrospective connection more apparent, 7:18-23 further alludes to 6:20-21 by closing with a macarism.³⁶³ The enthusiastic nature of 7:23, framed as it is as a blessing, directly reflects the jubilant time of fulfillment depicted in 7:22.³⁶⁴ The possibility that John's question in 7:18-19 alludes to Hab 2:1-3, where the prophet inquires as to the coming of the end,³⁶⁵ indicates that the entire pericope has been put together under this aegis.

Q 7:24-28: "Jesus Testifies About John" is an important unit which has been subjected to intense tradition-history and redaction-history analysis. Scholars have tended to resolve this cluster's tangle of statements about John into social and christological-development trajectories in which the tradent community tilts now one way, now another in its stance towards this figure.³⁶⁶ The crux status of the passage arises from the fact that some

challenge and shrewd response—against which allegedly later deviations and interpolations are measured. However, there is no one pure chreia form; chreias were created and circulated in any number of sizes, formats, and performances, the constant being the pointed conclusion (Robbins, "Chreia and Pronouncement Story," 6-8, 13-24; Hezser, "Verwendung," 371-73).

³⁶² Hoffmann, *Studien*, 209.

³⁶³ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 226, note 1, 323-24, 328; Robinson, "Sayings Gospel," 365-66. See also Sato, *Prophetie*, 142, Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 239, and idem, "Q und Jesus," 49, 53.

³⁶⁴ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.411.

³⁶⁵ Bovon, *Lukas*, 375; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.408-409, noting as well 1QpHab 7:1-5.

³⁶⁶ For example, Schönle: "Dabei ist bemerkenswert, daß sich in dem auf den ersten Blick verwirrenden Nebeneinander von negativen und positiven Aussagen über den Täufer...offenbar die sich wandelnde Einschätzung des Täufers sehr deutlich widerspiegelt....so dokumentiert sich hier so etwas wie eine Geschichte der christlichen Täuferdeutung seit ihren Anfängen" (*Johannes, Jesus*, 101).

scholars then utilize their results as leverage supporting more comprehensive redaction histories (or tradition cum redaction histories) of Q.³⁶⁷ However, genre-critical analysis of this text tends

³⁶⁷ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 116, takes 7:28, or 7:28b, to be a late addition which downplays the status awarded John in 7:26-27, and thus places it in a late redactional stratum which includes 3:16 and 7:18-23, which adopt a similar stance towards John. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 108-109, takes 7:24-26 as a chreia which originally terminated with the saying in 7:26b, but whose enigmatic nature invited attachment of two commentary words, first 7:28, since "explicit identifications of John with the Elijanic precursor are found only in later levels of tradition..." (109), and because 7:28 with its comparisons relates more directly to 7:26 than to 7:27 (110). Thus the tendency was at first to place John "outside the kingdom as the representative of a bygone epoch" (7:28), replaced by a later perspective "that he belongs alongside Jesus as a precursor" (7:27; see *Formation*, 110). Hoffmann, *Studien*, 217-20, sees 7:27, 28a, the latter perhaps being a tradition of John's disciples, as early commentaries on the enigmatic dominical sayings 7:24-26, and that 7:28b was then added as a Q-community "Korrektur" to the high evaluation of John in 7:28a. Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 27, takes 7:28 as a later addition because it degrades the high status of John propagated by 7:24-27. Lührmann takes the whole of 7:28 to be an addition because the neatness of the antithetical saying advises against its tradition-history partition (Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.419, and Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 233-34, argue on similar grounds against splitting the verse up). Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 237, takes 7:28 as dominical and an early commentary on 7:24-26, while 7:27 is a later inserted salvation-history commentary on the περισσότερον προφήτου of 7:26b. Schenk, *Synopse*, 43, understands 7:24-26, 28a to be an early form of the pericope which preserved Jesus' high evaluation of John, which was later commented on by Q redaction with the addition of 7:27 and 7:28b, which work out the relationship and relative status of Jesus and John. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 230, takes 7:24-26 as the primitive kernel, to which was added as commentary 7:27, 28 in the Hellenistic Jewish-Christian stage of Q. Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 124, likewise takes 7:24-26 as a self-contained unit, to which was added verse 27 as commentary and verse 28 as commentary on verse 27, relativizing the importance of the Baptist. This had to take place, however, before the redactional assembling of the entire John complex which was also responsible for attaching 7:31-35, which does not denigrate John, as do 7:18-23, 28, but allies him with Jesus against "this generation." Vaage, *Upstarts*, 97-101, 109, and idem, "More Than a Prophet, and Demon-Possessed: Q and the 'Historical' John," in *Conflict and Invention*, 181-202, esp. 191-93, sees a primitive chreia in 7:24-26 (and possibly 28a), the purpose of which is to affirm, in verse 25, John's Cynic-like identity, and to deny, with verse 26, the erroneous identification of him as a prophet, to which first was added 7:28(b), and then 7:27, as part of the same redaction which produced 3:16 and 7:18-23. He calls 7:24-28, taken as a whole, a "jumble of alternating points of view on John" ("More Than a Prophet," 191), a "jumble" arising from the collision of two views of John, the first a Cynic characterization from Q's formative stratum, the second a creation of Q's redaction which characterizes him as an eschatological prophet. Schürmann, "Zeugnis," 142, proposes that 7:24-27 is a "Grundwort" to which was added 7:28

rather to indicate that it has no recoverable redaction history behind the editorial action responsible for its present form.³⁶⁸

Culminating a unit with a paradoxical saying is attested in *Ptahhotep* 15:2-5: "Do not be arrogant because of your knowledge, but confer with the ignorant man as with the learned, for the limit of skill has not been attained, and there is no craftsman who has (fully) acquired his mastery. *Good speech is more hidden than malachite, yet it is found in the possession of women slaves at the millstones.*"³⁶⁹ Hyperbolic, "outbidding" comparative pronouncements are also common. Isocrates, comparing Athens with Sparta, states that "Athens, in her power, in her deeds and in her benefactions to the Hellenes, will be seen to have outdistanced Sparta more than Sparta the rest of the world."³⁷⁰ These parallels to the paradoxical saying as well as its manifest functional unity counsel against partition of 7:28ab into tradition-history fragments derived from alleged social-history and christological shifts affecting the community's view of John.

The genre classification of the unit as whole is an issue as complex as the passage itself. That it is framed as a chreia is without question. The chreiiic elements include not just the situational introduction but also the shrewd, paradoxical conclusion which forces listeners to consider a fresh perspective. However, the strong contrast 7:28 sets up between John and the "least in the kingdom" brings in additional genre considerations. The text

as a "Zusatzwort". Tuckett, "Mark and Q" 163-67, suggests that 7:27 may have been the first commentary to 7:24-26, or may have formed the original conclusion to the chreia, since "vv. 24-26 alone seem to be almost a torso and cry out for some clarification and conclusion" (165) which verse 27 supplies. Verse 27 cannot be ascribed to the same redactional stratum as 7:31-35 (here differing from Kloppenborg), because 7:27 distinguishes the status of the two, while 7:31-35 gives them equal status. Sato, *Prophetie*, 35, makes 7:27 the latest addition to the cluster because it breaks a good connection between 7:26 and 7:28; moreover its citation of Scripture links it with 4:1-13 and the "schriftgelehrte Arbeit" which produced both. Catchpole, "Beginning of Q," 209-10, proposes that 7:28a "form-critically...is the only element in vv. 27, 28 which will define and complete v. 26" (209), since it alone remarks on John's greatness in a manner responsive to 7:26b. By contrast, 7:27, 28b degrade John's status by making him inferior to Jesus.

³⁶⁸ Tradition history analyses of its constituent parts, however, are often illuminating.

³⁶⁹ On the paradoxical nature of 7:28 see Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 228.

³⁷⁰ Isocrates, *Panathenaicus*, translated by G. Norlin, LCL (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928; reprint 1980), 41.

incorporates features of the priamel, which William H. Race defines as follows:

A priamel...consists, basically, of two parts: "foil" and "climax." The function of the foil is to introduce and highlight the climactic term by enumerating or summarizing a number of "other" examples, subjects, times, places, or instances, which then yield (with varying degrees of contrast or analogy) to the particular point of interest or importance....even though the form and content may differ from priamel to priamel, they all share a single function: to single out one point of interest by contrast and comparison.³⁷¹

Frequently the characteristics of the "foil" are adduced in the superlative, only to be outbid by a surpassing superlative or comparative in the climax, introduced by a contrastive particle (for example, δέ, καί). Pindar's *First Olympian Ode* runs as follows: "Best is water; but gold, like fire gleaming in the night, is pre-eminent among lordly possessions."³⁷² As might be expected, comparatives and superlatives are signalizing elements of a priamel, as is a switch in subject as the priamel shifts from the foil to the climax. The hierarchalizing capacities of the priamel allow it to both *distinguish* and *relate* the two entities being compared.³⁷³ Clearly Q 7:24-28 conforms to the priamel pattern.³⁷⁴ Using a combination of comparatives and superlatives it establishes the greatness of John to introduce as a climax the surpassing greatness of the Kingdom and those privileged to belong to it. The description of John itself bears some of the traits of an *amplificatio*, or *incrementum*, which according to Lausberg "besteht in der von unten graduelle aufsteigenden sprachlichen Bezeichnung des zu amplifizierenden Gegenstandes." He adds that "bereits die unteren Grade als stark gelten, die dann durch den letzten Grad noch überboten werden."³⁷⁵ The Q passage begins with some

³⁷¹ William H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), ix-x. See also Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1205-06.

³⁷² Cited from Race, *Priamel*, x-xi; see also 14-20.

³⁷³ Race, *Priamel*, 23.

³⁷⁴ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 231, suggests that a priamel is present, but restricts it to verses 24-26, with "more than a prophet" providing the contrast.

³⁷⁵ Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.221-22; see also Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 157. Lausberg cites Cicero, *Verr.*, II.v.66, 170. See also Quintilian VIII.iv.3-5. Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 233-35, identifies 7:24-27 (excluding verse 28) as "Identifikatorische Akklamation," which he describes thus: "...wird nach einer Reihe vorläufiger oder falscher Aussagen am Schluß die richtige oder beste Antwort gegeben..."

generally accepted characteristics of John (7:24-25), followed by rapid stair-step intensification of the described attributes: "more than a prophet...he about whom it has been written," terminating in the ultimate praise, "among those born of women there has not arisen one greater than John." The *amplificatio* device, taken alone, does not account for the shift to assertion of the surpassing status of the Kingdom in 7:28b; the priamel executes this maneuver. An important element of the *amplificatio*, verse 27, defines the eschatological relationship between John and Jesus which serves to set up the concluding element of the priamel—the assertion of the high status of those in the Kingdom in comparison to John.³⁷⁶ The unit thus combines the elements of priamel and *amplificatio*, a compositional stroke of genius which satisfies Q's concern to honor John while at the same time ranking him in such a manner as to promote the surpassing greatness of the Kingdom.³⁷⁷ With its operative genres understood, the cohesion and coherence of this text are seen to "go all the way down"; no redaction-history layers can be dug out of it; hence it preserves no christological or social-history trajectory.

Q 7:31-35: Scholars agree that the parable of the Children in the Marketplace is a compositional unity though a composite of diverse materials.³⁷⁸ In its present form 7:31-35 consists of "a parable (vss. 31-32), to which an interpretation has been appended (vss. 33-35), and which is concluded by a summarizing proverb (vs. 35)."³⁷⁹ The appending of a concluding aphorism reversing characterizations set up earlier in the unit makes 7:31-35 parallel to 7:18-23 and 7:24-28. "This generation's" prejudicial assessments of John and Jesus in verses 31-34 are rejected by verse

(233). One of the indicators of this genre is the formula: "this is..." (οὗτός ἐστιν...) or "you are..." Berger states, "Das 'dieser ist...' bezeichnet gegebenenfalls die Enthüllung des wahren Wesens einer Figur durch einen anderen, der so dessen wahre und vor Gott gültige Bedeutung für die Menschen auslegt" (234).

³⁷⁶ Bovon, *Lukas*, 377-78; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.416.

³⁷⁷ See Hoffmann, "Redaction of Q," 179, and Wendy Cotter, "Yes, I tell you, and more than a prophet." The Function of John in Q," in *Conflict and Invention*, 167. Race, *Priamel*, 24, notes that in Vergil *Ecl.* 2.63-65, "the forms of the climax [*gradatio*] and priamel merge, creating a very specific type of priamel."

³⁷⁸ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 110-12, 117, Sato, *Prophetic*, 180-81, Sevensch-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 231-32, and Hoffmann, *Studien*, 232.

³⁷⁹ Cameron, "Characterizations," 40. Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 29, note 6, points out that the association of wisdom instruction with children is conventional.

35. "This generation," in context agents of censure who deem themselves competent to evaluate and label prophetic figures and who distinguish themselves disdainfully from declass  social groups, fail to grasp the presence of Wisdom among them in John and Jesus and thus misconstrue these two figures. The characterization of John's asceticism as demonization and Jesus' joyous table fellowship as dissipation constitutes a deviancy-labelling attempt by these agents of censure, repulsed by the counter-assertion of 7:35: Wisdom herself was present in John and Jesus and is present among their followers.

Despite difficulties correlating the elements of the interpretation (7:33-34) to the specifics of the parable, it is clear that the interpretation attempts to coordinate the parable with characterizations of John's and Jesus' ministries. Concluding a parable and its interpretation with an aphoristic saying is conventional.³⁸⁰ Some scholars suggest that the reference to τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην and possibly παιδίοις in 7:31-32 forms an antithetical framework in correspondence to the τῶν τέκνων of 7:35, contrasting "this generation" with the children of Wisdom.³⁸¹ All these features indicate that 7:31-35 is a cohesive composition.

It is now clear that both framework units subdivide into three smaller compositions. Beginning from John's speech and progressing unit by unit through to the retrospective, culminating parable of the children in the marketplace, the framework units work out a linear elaboration, a major purpose of which, as Robinson has indicated, is to legitimate Jesus as the "Coming One" announced by John and expand upon the significance of that title. John sermonizes, then announces the Coming One, identified as Jesus in the Baptism, when the Spirit descends ἐπ' αὐτόν. The Isaianic allusion is then taken up more explicitly, both by Jesus' own Sermon announcing blessing on the poor and the mourning and by 7:18-23, the next unit in the frameworking sequence, a unit constructed, as noted above, to recapitulate the units which precede it, inclusive of the incipit of the Ser-

³⁸⁰ Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 50.

³⁸¹ Polag, *Christologie*, 137-38; L hrmann, *Redaktion*, 31; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 336, 350; Sch rmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.427; Piper, *Wisdom*, 168; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 229; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 124-25; Vaage, "Son of Man Sayings," 111.

mon.³⁸² In 7:24-28 Jesus retrospectively evaluates John's ministry (3:7-9, 16-17; the sequence also establishes a relative chronology for the two figures), and in 7:31-35 in a comprehensive, cumulative manner assesses John's (3:7-9, 16-17) and his own (6:20b-49) ministry as regards the response to both by "this generation". In the opening unit John had raised the question of the true identity of the "children (τέκνα) of Abraham." By the time we reach the climax of the culminating unit, this question has been answered: they are the children (τέκνα) of Wisdom, the followers of John and Jesus.³⁸³

A cross-sectioning coordination (abca'b'c') of the individual units in the framework creates a *synkrisis* (comparison of John and Jesus) embedded within the linear elaboration.³⁸⁴ Those accustomed to *Kleinliteratur* understandings of Q's formation may resist the notion that a "double-movement" textual arrangement such as this should appear in Q, but the fact that an identical coordination of linear with cross-sectioning movement manifestly controls the composition of the first creation story (Gen 1:1-2:4) indicates that the capacity to produce such arrangements was part a competent scribe's repertoire.³⁸⁵

a - a' (3:7-9 & 7:18-23): Semantic, form-critical, and thematic *antithesis* characterizes the relationship between these units, which contrast the messages of John and Jesus respectively. John preaches the *coming wrath* (τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς) to "you brood of vipers"

³⁸² On the cohesion-producing effect of the constellation of Isaianic allusions among these sequenced units see Robinson, "Sayings Gospel Q," 365. Urging caution as regards the strength Q gives these allusions (reacting to the excessive tendency to designate Q a "Sayings Gospel") is Franz Neirynck, "Q: From Source to Gospel," *ETL* 71 (1995) 421-30, esp. 427.

³⁸³ On the inclusio established by the repetition of τέκνα in 3:8b and 7:35 see Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 463. The framework of the Mission Instruction (9:57-60; 10:21-22) sets up a not dissimilar elaboration, treating as it does the issue of family identity.

³⁸⁴ Parunak, "Oral Typesetting," 164, states, "When a modern author wishes to make similar observations about each of a number of topics, he frequently arranges the topics as rows of a columnar table, with one column for each observation. Literary structures serve such a purpose for the ancient writer."

³⁸⁵ a: first day-light//a': fourth day-sun and moon; b: second day-sky and waters//b': fifth day-fish and birds; c: third day-dry land & vegetation//c': sixth day-animals and humans. See Philip Davies and John Rogerson, *The Old Testament World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 202. The same arrangement is visible in the B-B' units of *Wis* 1:1-6:21 and the D-D' units of Solomon's Prayer in *Wis* 9 (see above).

(γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν). Jesus preaches *good news* to the poor (πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται). Fittingly, 3:7-9 concludes with a *threat of judgment* (3:9), 7:18-23 with a *macarism*. That 7:18-23 intends to profile the message of Jesus is established by the fact that preaching to the poor and the macarism are reminiscent of the incipit of the Inaugural Sermon (6:20b-21; see above), itself juxtaposed contrastively to John's preaching.³⁸⁶ Accordingly, a change in tone takes place between John's threatening, abrasive speech in 3:7-9 and 7:18-23, characterized by the joyousness which attends fulfillment of promise.³⁸⁷

b - b' (3:16-17 & 7:24-28): *Comparison* of rank and role as well as a corresponding effort at *hierarchalization* characterize both of these units.³⁸⁸ Correspondingly, comparative forms or their semantic equivalents are important function words in both. In 3:16 these are ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμί ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι.³⁸⁹ In 7:24-28 they are περισσότερον προφήτου...μείζων Ἰωάννου; ὁ μικρότερος...μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, and verses 24-26 compare John with various entities: a reed, those dressed in soft clothes, a prophet.³⁹⁰ In 3:16-17 John announces a coming agent of judgment (ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος) and describes prospectively the Coming One's activities; moreover, John's baptism appears to function in an unspecified preliminary manner (probably of repentance) with respect to this figure's anticipated

³⁸⁶ Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 239. The proximity of Jesus' sermon to John's as being a contrastive juxtaposition was suggested by Harnack, *Sayings*, 202. This juxtaposition works out continuities as well as contrasts, for example, both John and Jesus demand good fruit; see Hoffmann, *Studien*, 39, and Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 104. John's and Jesus' sermons both conclude with contrasts of the fates of the righteous and the wicked (3:16; 6:47-49).

³⁸⁷ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.175, 411; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 331, note 3 ("Genau umgekehrt"). See also Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 418, and idem, "Q und Jesus," 41.

³⁸⁸ Robinson, "Sayings Gospel," 362. To be sure, comparison is a pervasive feature of the entire *synkrisis*. However, these two units are concerned with ranking and role hierarchalization with respect to John and Jesus—and uniquely adduce comparative and superlative forms to do so—in a manner which renders them quite distinct formally and thematically from other units in the *synkrisis*.

³⁸⁹ On the emphatic position given to this comparative ranking in the composition of 3:16-17 see Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 376, Vaage, "More Than a Prophet," 219, and Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 119.

³⁹⁰ Noting the density of comparative forms are Uro, "John the Baptist," 235-36, Tuckett, "Mark and Q," 171, and Catchpole, "Beginning of Q," 215.

activities. In 7:24-28 Jesus describes John's role retrospectively as the one sent to prepare his way (ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου).³⁹¹ Thus the notion is advanced that their roles are complementary. Most importantly, while both units go to pains to depict the greatness of John—in 3:16 the repentance preacher and baptizer, in 7:24-28a "more than a prophet" and greatest born of women—the comparisons carried out in both units show, almost hyperbolically, John's low status relative to the Coming One (3:16) or the "least in the Kingdom" (7:28). Thereby Q strives to achieve a delicate balance poised between honoring John and appropriately ranking him.³⁹² Finally, both units conclude with a reference to those in the Kingdom: the wheat in the granary (συνάξει τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην) and the "least in the Kingdom" (μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ).

c - c' (3:21-22 & 7:31-35): In both of these units John and Jesus share the stage. Accordingly, hierarchalizing aspects recede in favor of features which tend to view John and Jesus together, though in neither 3:21-22 nor in 7:31-35 is John permitted to encroach upon Jesus' superior position. Divine or semi-divine entities appear in both: the πνεῦμα in 3:21-22, and Σοφία in 7:31-35, a significant correlation in view of the fact that in Jewish wisdom literature God's Spirit and Wisdom were viewed as virtually interchangeable entities.³⁹³ At the Baptism the heavenly voice acclaims Jesus as "beloved son" (ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός), while 7:31-35 presents Jesus as the Son of Man (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), a coordination identical, though in reverse order, to

³⁹¹ Hoffmann, "Redaction of Q, 189.

³⁹² Hoffmann, *Studien*, 224; idem, "Redaction of Q," 178-79; see also Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 280-81, 325-26 (against the notion that anti-John polemic is present in 7:18-23, contrary to Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 203), and Tuckett, "Mark and Q," 172.

³⁹³ E. g., *Wis* 1:4-6; 7:7 (πνεῦμα σοφίας), 22-28; 9:17; Job 32:8; *Sir* 24:3; 39:6-7, *Joseph & Aseneth* 4:7-9; 19:11, and Philo *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres* 126-28. See Markus Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*, WUNT 2.36 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]), 65, J. Coert Rylaarsdam, *Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), 99-122, Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 56-59, Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct*, 22, and Silvia Schroer, "Der Geist, die Weisheit und die Taube," *FZPhTh* 33 (1986) 197-225. 1 *Enoch* 48:7; 49:3-4 collocate "wisdom" and "spirit" and simultaneously refer to the Son of Man or the "Elect One". See also Acts 6:3 and 1 Cor 1:24, 30.

the one found in the framework units of the Mission Instruction (9:57-60; 10:21-22). Like 9:57-60, 7:31-35 presents the Son of Man in his lowly state, ascribed shameful status, accused of shameful behavior, and associated with low-status social groups, while 3:21-22, like 10:21-22, presents him in receipt of unsurpassable ascribed honor.³⁹⁴ Finally, in both John retains subordinate status, for in 3:21-22 God's ascription of honor lights upon Jesus, while 7:31-35 gives Jesus the special title, the Son of Man, in Q a title of honor, though to be sure, used here ironically, as it is in 9:57-60.³⁹⁵

As suggested by the more ubiquitous distribution of ὁ ἐρχόμενος and cognate verbs (3:7, 16; 7:19, 24-26, 33-34), the framework units of the Inaugural Discourse act as a compositional mechanism which mediates conflicts between John's characterization of the Coming One and Jesus' enactment of that role.³⁹⁶ The linear arrangement of the units in this discourse also contributes to this effect. In 3:16-17 John describes the Coming One as a dispenser of fiery judgment, and 3:21-22 places the imprimatur on Jesus as that Coming One. Then follows Jesus' own sermon (6:20b-49) and his healing of the Centurion's Child (7:1-10). This permits the contours of Jesus' message and activities to emerge, setting the stage for John's inquiry: is Jesus really the Coming One?³⁹⁷ Jesus' answer, as well as his speeches in 7:24-28, 31-35,

³⁹⁴ Neyrey and Malina, "Honor and Shame," 54.

³⁹⁵ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 230; see also idem, "Redaction of Q" 178, protesting against the notion that the Q Son of Man sayings can be parcelled out with respect to their significance through the device of stratification. Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 356-57, and Schenk, *Synopse*, 47, citing 1 Enoch 42; 48:7; 49:1-4, note that in some circles Son of Man and Wisdom were virtually interchangeable mythic figures. Finally, the feasting ascribed to Jesus better fits the profile of Wisdom's activity than do the ascetic practices of John.

Robinson argues that 7:34 accords Jesus no special superiority ("Son of Man", 322), but (other than his dubious assertion that if Q had wished here to ascribe an honorific title to Jesus it should have been ὁ ἐρχόμενος) he predicates his assessment on an evaluation of the primitive tradition-history meaning of this particular Son of Man saying, combined with analysis of its significance in the immediate context of 7:31-35, not taking account of the fact that the saying, regardless of its past tradition-history meanings, is now positioned within a network of semantic relations constituted by the encompassing text.

³⁹⁶ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 326; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 214-15; Cotter, "Function of John," 140-41; Kloppenborg, "Social History," 93-94. See also Robinson, "Sayings Gospel," 361-62.

³⁹⁷ Robinson, "Weisheit oder Prophetie," 383.

affirm this identity, but emend John's initial characterization of the Coming One by expanding on the nature of his ministry and role in comparison with John's.³⁹⁸ This emendation is carried out in such a way that both John and his message are appropriated for the Q group.³⁹⁹ The group honors John as one of its founders and a primeval font of Q's message, while at the same time placing him far below Jesus in rank.

As indicated, this is accomplished by means of a *synkrisis*. *Synkrisis* was a widely used rhetorical and literary genre, taught in the *progymnasmata*, which was invoked for contrasts and comparisons of two entities, usually two people.⁴⁰⁰ Corresponding to the agonistic nature of the genre, the function of *synkrisis* was to establish *preeminence* by working out hierarchies of rank and significance, as well as to sketch and contrast characters, with *differences and similarities* of words, deeds, and fate subject to close examination.⁴⁰¹ *Synkrisis* was also used agonistically to contrast and rank literary works or speeches and their respective authors. One such *synkrisis* compares Homer and Hesiod, with Hesiod carrying off the prize because his works commended agricultural pursuits and peace, in contrast to Homer, who focused on battles and butcheries.⁴⁰² Aristophanes' *The Frogs* features a *synkrisis* of Euripides and Aeschylus, with Aeschylus emerging as superior. The contest between the playwrights centers around their style of expression, their language, and their themes (*The Frogs*, 830-1470). Herodotus and Thucydides were compared, as were the comedians Menander and Philemon, and Dionysios of Halicarnassus compared the Attic rhetors (345-46). Plutarch's *Lives* are a form

³⁹⁸ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989), 96-99; Catchpole, "Beginning of Q," 211-12; Robinson, "Sayings Gospel," 362; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 309, 322, 326, 346-47; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 213-15; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.409, 412; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 201; Cotter, "Function of John," 167; Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 235; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 108.

³⁹⁹ See Hoffmann, *Studien*, 211-14, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 95, and Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 325.

⁴⁰⁰ Friedrich Focke, "Synkrisis," *Hermes* 58 (1923) 327-68, esp. 330-31; Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1175; Gammie, "Morphology," 56.

⁴⁰¹ Focke, "Synkrisis," 328, 332, 338, 342-45, 359-60. "Um ὁμοιότητες und διαφοραί handelte es sich..." (352). See also Race, *Priamel*, 20.

⁴⁰² Cited in Focke, "Synkrisis," 340, as "201 f. Rz." [Rzach, editor of the 1902 Teubner edition of Hesiod]: δίκαιον εἶναι τὸν ἐπὶ γεωργίαν καὶ εἰρήνην προκαλούμενον νικᾶν, οὐ τὸν πολέμους καὶ σφαγὰς διεξιόντα.

of *synkrisis*. Lucian's *Demonax* begins by comparing Demonax with "another Cynic figure, Sostratus, one who lived out in the open, slept rough, slew robbers."⁴⁰³ In contrast to the rough-hewn Sostratus, Demonax is the gentler urbanite. Philostratos (*Life of Apollonius*, VII.1-4) compares Apollonius with several other venerated sages (Zeno, Plato, Phyton, Heraclides, Diogenes, Crates) with regard to behavior when threatened by tyrants. Though all behaved admirably in many respects, Apollonius is shown to be superior in such deportment.

The combination of Q 3:7-9, 16-17, 21-22; 7:18-28, 31-35 conforms superbly to the genre *synkrisis*. John and Jesus are compared in terms of difference and similarity with respect to their messages, deeds, roles, even fates (7:31-35). The Q *synkrisis* ranks Jesus above John, though the *agon* remains friendly.⁴⁰⁴ In fact, *synkrisis* was seen to be most effective and appropriate in the case of persons or entities which were in certain respects similar.⁴⁰⁵ Thus the purpose of the Q *synkrisis* is anything but denigration of John. On the other hand, the function of *synkrisis* to show the ultimate superiority of, and focus particular praise upon one figure makes its use in Q's Inaugural Discourse, where the generative concern is to legitimate Jesus and establish his honor, wholly appropriate. As was the case with the priamel in 7:24-28, the *synkrisis* integrates the heterogeneous materials of the framework in such a thoroughly cohesive and coherent manner that it is impossible to posit redaction-history layers (tradition histories of individual elements again being another matter). Both cases illustrate how failure to recognize formative genres and accurately appraise operative compositional and stylistic conventions leads to proliferation of spurious redaction histories and ancillary conjecturings of dubious social-history and christological trajectories. Robinson, for example, contends that Q's tendency in this sec-

⁴⁰³ Downing, "Genre for Q," 6.

⁴⁰⁴ The culture was agonistic; the appearance of an *agon* in Q should not automatically be interpreted as "polemic".

⁴⁰⁵ "...but even as we examine purple and gold and test them by placing them side by side with articles of similar appearance and of the same estimated value, so also in the case of states one should compare...those which have similar powers, and have engaged in the same deeds and enjoyed a like freedom of action. For thus one may best arrive at the truth" (Isocrates, *Panathenaisus*, 39). Isocrates then compares Athens with Sparta, assigning preeminence to Athens.

tion is to present Jesus as *primus inter pares*, "to relativize the uniqueness of Jesus," and that "this 'christology' of 'more than a prophet' does not distinguish Jesus from John but brings them together."⁴⁰⁶ Once the genres operative in Q 3 and Q 7 are recognized and the composition evaluated accordingly, Q is seen to be engaged in a christological program the precise opposite of that suggested by Robinson. The Q *synkrisis*, here enacting its typical function to establish preeminence by configuring similarities and differences in such a manner as to achieve that end, places Jesus far above John in rank and significance. Accordingly, this christological enterprise cannot be written off as the contribution of the last in a putative series of redactional initiatives; rather, it is thoroughly constitutive of the formation of Q's text.

As noted, Sevenich-Bax proposes that the Temptation and the Healing form an inner framework (two paradigms) around the Sermon. A number of scholars characterize the Temptation (4:1-13) as a *Fremdkörper* and designate it a late redactional interpolation. Kloppenborg has articulated the arguments for this position most rigorously.⁴⁰⁷ However, he acknowledges that the Temptation has a synchronic function, namely, testing as a means of credentialing the sage prior to presentation of the teaching, a compositional-rhetorical device attested in other wisdom texts (for example, Lucian's *Demonax*). The Temptation also functions paraenetically—using Jesus as a paradigm for certain behavior, a pragmatic function which aligns it with the other Q materials.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁶ Robinson, "Sophos & Sophia," 6; idem, "The Sayings of Jesus: Q," *Drew Gateway* 54 (1983) 26-37, esp. 29. Robinson also states, "John's lofty status is exploited by Q to put in prominence Jesus' even loftier status" ("Incipit," 30), but again (referring to 7:34), "Whereas Christian texts normally put Jesus above John, here both are put side by side" ("Son of Man," 322). Ambivalence like this arises from failing to recognize the operative genre.

⁴⁰⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 246-62. See also Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 184-85, Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 56, Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 90-91, 159, Sato, *Prophetie*, 35-36, Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 60, Robinson, "Sayings Gospel," 362, and Dieter Zeller, "Die Versuchung Jesu in der Logienquelle," *TTZ* 89 (1980) 61-73, esp. 62.

⁴⁰⁸ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 250, 256, idem, "Antique Instructional Genres," 155, and below. Hugh M. Humphrey, "Temptation and Authority: Sapiential Narratives in Q," *BTB* 21 (1991) 43-50, esp. 49, draws attention to the testing of the righteous man in *Wis* 2.

The combination of example and precept, of *bios* and *logos*, is a well-attested feature of ancient paraenesis.⁴⁰⁹ Didactic narratives or didactic passages which employ narrative scenery are also attested in instructional literature, as are biographical elements.⁴¹⁰

Form-critically 4:1-13 presents a number of features which may be impossible to resolve into one simple genre categorization. As noted, passages with narrative scenery are not foreign to wisdom genres. What Di Lella calls "didactic narrative", Römheld "Beispiel-erzählung", and Müller "weisheitliche Lehrerzählung" are attested, among other places, in Prov 7:6-23, *Sir* 44:1-50:24 (Praise of the Ancestors), and *T. Jos* 2:4-10:3.⁴¹¹ The Temptation also incorporates features of another form attested for wisdom texts, the disputation or *Streitgespräch*, which itself can incorporate a variety of genres and sceneries.⁴¹² Robbins characterizes the Temptation as a chreia, a categorization which Berger vigorously rejects.⁴¹³ It bears some resemblance to a chreia cited by Theon of Alexandria, 84-93: "Alexander the Macedonian king stood over Diogenes as he slept and said (*Il.* 2.24): 'To sleep all night ill suits a counselor,' and Diogenes responded (*Il.* 2.25): 'On whom the folk rely, whose cares are many.'"⁴¹⁴ Here the antagonist, Alexander, adduces an authoritative citation which the sage shrewdly

⁴⁰⁹ Benjamin Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*, *Analecta Biblica* 105 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 131; Perdue, "Social Character," 16-17; Müller, "Weisheitliche Lehrerzählung," 94.

⁴¹⁰ See Römheld, *Formgeschichte*, 129-30; Müller, "Weisheitliche Lehrerzählung," *passim*.

⁴¹¹ Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 29-30; see Römheld, *Formgeschichte*, 129-30.

⁴¹² Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 25; Walter Grundmann, "Weisheit im Horizont," 193 ("weisheitliches Streitgespräch"). Gese, "Weisheitsdichtung," 1577, lists "Streitgespräch" as a "beliebt" form in didactic poetry, and Cancik, "Bios und Logos," 122-23, notes its presence in the chreia collection. See also James L. Crenshaw, "Wisdom and Authority: Sapiential Rhetoric and Its Warrants," in *Congress Volume, Vienna, 1980*, ed by J. A. Emerton, VT Suppl. 32 (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 10-29, esp. 26, ("framing narrative and a dialogue"), C. E. Carlston, "Wisdom and Eschatology in Q," in *Logia*, 101-119, esp. 106, Bovon, *Lukas*, 202, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 258, note 37, who notes *p. Shek.* 5.49b where "R. Hanina b. Pappai (ca. 300 CE) disputes in this way with the lord of the demons...."

⁴¹³ Robbins, "The Chreia," 9-10; Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen," 1310. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 258, similarly assesses the Temptation as "non-chreia."

⁴¹⁴ Cited from Hock and O'Neil, *Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, 87.

deflects by means of a second citation.⁴¹⁵ The tripartite question and answer structure finds a parallel in *Syr. Men.* 78-93, where the "companions of Homer" (Homer is the sage) ask him a series of three questions, to the first two of which he gives a short answer, and to the third a longer, climactic answer, a progression which resembles the structure of the Temptation.⁴¹⁶ In view of these considerations, it is difficult to maintain the *Fremdkörper* characterization of the passage.⁴¹⁷

The Temptation fulfills, as noted, the specific function of testing and thereby legitimating the seer.⁴¹⁸ Thus it is no accident that, similarly to Demonax's trial for *asebeia*, the Temptation is placed just prior to Jesus beginning to teach (6:20b-49) and, moreover, to his self-advertisement as being a competent sage.⁴¹⁹ Q prepares for Jesus' Inaugural Sermon by two acts of legitimation: first Jesus' endowment with the Spirit (3:21-22), by virtue of its framework connection with 7:31-35 also endowment with Wisdom, followed by Jesus prevailing over the supreme antagonist in a severe testing, in which he shows himself to be an obedient son, a faithful Israelite, skillful in wielding the Torah, a guardian of its central command, "Worship the Lord your God, and serve only him," and who by his authoritative words repels Satan.⁴²⁰ By showing Jesus advertent to and skillfully manipulat-

⁴¹⁵ In Lucian's *Demonax*, 60, the sage quotes from Homer.

⁴¹⁶ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 57.

⁴¹⁷ Kloppenborg bases his assessment on the notion that the Temptation is "anomalous" within a sayings collection (*Formation*, 246).

⁴¹⁸ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 87, idem, "Antique Instructional Genres," 153, idem, *Formation*, 325-27, referring to narrative prologues to *Anksheshong*, *Ahikar*, *Life of Aesop*, and *Demonax*. See also Zeller, "Versuchung," 63-64, and Cancik, "Bios und Logos," 121-22 (on the trial of Demonax, placed prior to the instructional section). Testing stories were used to enhance the status of the hero in a number of genres (Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 261-62).

⁴¹⁹ See Mark McVann, "One of the Prophets: Matthew's Testing Narrative as a Rite of Passage," *BTB* 23 (1993) 14-20, esp. 14, Carruth, "Persuasion," 308, and Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Temptation Narrative in Q," in *Four Gospels*, 1.479-507, esp. 489. Tuckett rejects the notion that the Temptation is intrusive.

⁴²⁰ See Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 447, 460-61, Polag, *Christologie*, 148, Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 7-8, 26, Carlston, "Wisdom and Eschatology," 106, Theissen, *Gospels in Context*, 206, Bovon, *Lukas*, 198, Mark McVann, "Rituals of Status Transformation in Luke-Acts: The Case of Jesus the Prophet," in *Social World of Luke-Acts*, 333-60, esp. 352-56, idem, "One of the Prophets," 19, and Tuckett, "Temptation Narrative," 489.

ing the Torah to these ends, Q ascribes to Jesus high status and establishes his credentials to instruct Israel authoritatively.⁴²¹ That the Temptation constructs Jesus as a scribe is obvious,⁴²² yet apposite to its instructional genre. Moreover in the Temptation Jesus conforms to the ideal of the exemplary obedient son repeatedly profiled in instructional literature and thus, as noted, functions paradigmatically for those to whom the Q instructions are directed.⁴²³

Most commentators analyze 7:1-10 (Healing of the Centurion's Child) as a form-critical hybrid that combines elements of miracle story and chreia encounter, and in which the dialogical elements have come to dominate.⁴²⁴ A miracle story (specifically, a *Fernheilung*) supplies the narrative framework, but typical miracle story elements—the meeting of the centurion with the wonder-worker, the request for healing stating the sickness, reaction of the wonder-worker, word of healing, marveling bystanders—recede or are transformed in order to give place to atypical elements, in particular the renewed speech of the centurion about the power of Jesus' word. This speech and Jesus' astonished reaction replace the healing as the central focus of the pericope. The marveling of the wonder-worker and his acclamation of the centurion at the latter's insight and faith constitute a permutation of the convention that has the crowd marvel at the miracle and acclaim the wonder-worker.⁴²⁵ Along with its chreia transformation a few wisdom elements have migrated into the pericope. The centurion's speech works out a comparison drawn from a typical sphere of human interaction, supplying a rationale for the centurion's recognition of Jesus' surpassing authority.⁴²⁶

⁴²¹ See Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 26, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 261.

⁴²² Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 94; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.208-209. See also Polag, *Christologie*, 148.

⁴²³ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 94-95; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 325; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 447-48; Zeller, "Versuchung," 63, 69-72; Carruth, "Persuasion," 309.

⁴²⁴ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 57; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 240-41; Uwe Wegner, *Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum*, WUNT 2/14 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1985), 341-43; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 65.

⁴²⁵ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 454-57 ("Rollentausch"); Schenk, *Synopse*, 38-39; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.390; Wegner, *Hauptmann*, 342-43.

⁴²⁶ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 456; Edwards, *Theology*, 94; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 207; David R. Catchpole, "The Centurion's Faith and Its Function in Q," in *The Four Gospels*, 1. 518-540, esp. 536-37. Zeller thus overstates mat-

The story may function as a *Beispielierzählung* with respect to the obedience to Jesus' words urged in the closing verses of the Sermon (6:46-49).⁴²⁷ Recurrence of the key words κύριε (6:46; 7:6) and λόγος (6:47, 49; 7:7) supports this interpretation, that is, if this lexical connection can be viewed as more than just mechanical. However, the story goes beyond just illustrating the admonitions of the Sermon, for the Centurion is not portrayed enacting either the specific behaviors profiled in the constituent instructions of the Sermon or the "hearing and doing" urged in 6:46-49.⁴²⁸ The story introduces a new topic—amazing faith—though in this respect it may function as specifying commentary upon the parable of the builders in 6:46-49, further defining adherence to Jesus' words as great faith.⁴²⁹ The centurion is indeed an exemplar of the submission to Jesus urged in 6:46-49, but both his request and his speech point to Jesus' authority.⁴³⁰ As such the story has, like the Temptation, a *legitimizing* function: the Sermon, predicated upon Jesus' authority, is followed by a chreia miracle story in which that authority is recognized and shown to be efficacious in the most difficult act of power, a *Fernheilung*.⁴³¹ The praise of the centurion's faith makes the

ters when he describes 7:1-10 as a "vom Stoff her fremden Geschichte" (*Kommentar*, 38).

⁴²⁷ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 58; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 45, 110; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 458. Catchpole, "Centurion," 537, suggests that the centurion's recognition of Jesus' surpassing authority makes him a "model" of the response urged in 6:46-49.

⁴²⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 117; see also Wegner, *Hauptmann*, 300.

⁴²⁹ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 58; Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 457-58; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.389; Catchpole, "Centurion," 537. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 117, protests that the great faith praised by Jesus is not related to his teaching but to his authority as a wonder-worker. Ernst Bammel, "Der Anfang des Spruchbuchs," in *Synoptic Gospels*, 467-75, esp. 472-73, see also 473, note 40, points out that in Mark 1:27, 44; 2:5, 9 Jesus' teaching is followed and thus legitimated by a miracle. He also argues for a "Zusammenhang zwischen Rede und Wunder...im jüdischen Prophetismus," citing 1 Kings 17:17-24; 2 Kings 4:32-37, and also *bMez* 59b.

⁴³⁰ Catchpole, "Centurion," 527.

⁴³¹ See Bammel, "Anfang," 472-73, also 473, note 40, Tödt, *Son of Man*, 257, Wegner, *Hauptmann*, 300, 386, Polag, *Christologie*, 158, Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 128, Zeller, *Kommentar*, 39, and Josef Blank, "Zur Christologie ausgewählter Wunderberichte," in Josef Blank, *Schriftauslegung in Theorie und Praxis* (München: Kösel, 1969), 104-28, esp. 115-17, who suggests that the point of 7:7-8 is to equate the power of Jesus' word with the word of Yahweh (citing Psalm 33:9, Gen 1, Isa 55:6-13).

story show that the appropriate response to Jesus' authority is great faith.⁴³² By choosing a Gentile to exemplify such faith Q intends to shame Israel.⁴³³

With the form-critical attributes and redactional interests represented by the Temptation and the Healing of the Centurion's Child clarified, the way is cleared for some macro-compositional observations with respect to these two passages. It is noteworthy that in 4:5-8 Jesus rejects the devil's offer of worldly kingdoms in exchange for worshipping him, while in 7:1-10 a centurion, the ubiquitous representative of the major imperial power, acknowledges Jesus' authority and addresses him as κύριε. Text-pragmatically both passages have a dual legitimating and paradigmatic function: both establish and confirm the authority of Jesus; both are exemplary.⁴³⁴ Between this legitimating framework is placed Jesus' Inaugural Sermon, with βασιλεία (4:5; 6:20b) providing the associative hook on the one side,⁴³⁵ and κύριε, λόγος (6:47, 49; 7:6, 7) on the other, all either authority or speech words.⁴³⁶ Carruth points out that the admonitions of the Sermon are predicated upon an extremely high authority status claimed by the speaker.⁴³⁷ This assertion of authority stands in need of legitimation. Sequenced before and after the Sermon respectively, the Temptation and the Healing credential Jesus as the speaker of the Sermon, justify the authority with which it is spoken, and promote the saving, healing power of the words spoken and their speaker.⁴³⁸

The Healing story places Jesus' rebuke of Israel in the cli-

⁴³² Robinson, "Weisheit oder Prophetie?" 384.

⁴³³ Kloppenborg, "Response," 207; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 128. The motif of the exceptional Gentile who acts as a foil to an Israel resistant to the proclamations of prophets is pervasive, for example, in the Elijah-Elisha cycle of stories—the widow of Zarephath; Naaman, the foreign military man likewise the beneficiary of a *Fernheilung*, contrasted with Gehazi, the Israelite who gets Naaman's leprosy (see also Ezek 3:4-7).

⁴³⁴ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 266, 459; Humphry, "Sapiential Narratives," 43; see also Blank, "Wunderberichte," 117-18.

⁴³⁵ Noted by Tuckett, "Temptation," 504-505.

⁴³⁶ Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 267.

⁴³⁷ Shawn Carruth, "Strategies of Authority: A Rhetorical Study of the Character of the Speaker in Q 6:20-49," in *Conflict and Invention*, 98-115; see also Carruth, "Persuasion," 308.

⁴³⁸ 7:1-10 also anticipates 7:18-35; see Catchpole, "Centurion," 518, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 119-21.

mactic position alongside his acclamation of the centurion's faith. The temptations, pointedly reminiscent of the experiences of the archetypal wilderness generation, also contain an implicit rebuke of Israel. Stegner in fact shows that these three temptations derive from a tripartite exegetical tradition (of Deuteronomy) focused upon rebuke of Israel.⁴³⁹ Moreover, in his wilderness testings Jesus proves himself an obedient son in distinction from the wilderness generation, whose unbelief and idolatry are recalled by the Deuteronomy citations.⁴⁴⁰ In 7:9 Jesus shames Israel for inadequate response to his word. By means of this text sequence Q in effect warns Jesus' contemporaries that unless they respond to this fresh, authoritative expression of God's will, they risk becoming the *Doppelgänger* of the wilderness generation.

Enclosing an instruction (6:20b-49) within legitimating frame narratives (4:1-13; 7:1-10), one identifying and legitimating the sage, the other praising the sage as well as occasionally showing the benefits of following the seer's teaching, is attested in instructional literature.⁴⁴¹ In Q the effort toward legitimation extends into the outer framework as well: the speaker is the Coming One endowed with the Spirit (3:16-17, 21-22); he is the bringer of the Isaianic restoration (7:18-23), the one of whom the prophets spoke (7:24-26), and the speaker of Wisdom (7:31-35). Moreover, he is ascribed the honor of being the obedient son of God (3:21-22; 4:1-13). Malina and Rohrbaugh state that "designating Jesus

⁴³⁹ William Richard Stegner, "The Temptation Narrative: A Study in the Use of Scripture by Early Jewish Christians," *BR* 35 (1990) 5-17, esp. 13-15. "Rebuke" does not equate with "rejection".

⁴⁴⁰ See Polag, *Christologie*, 147, 151; Stegner, "Temptation Narrative," 10-11; Birger Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4:1-11 & Par). An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash*, ConB; New Testament Series 2 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966), 11, 25, 51-52.

⁴⁴¹ Michael V. Fox, "Frame-Narrative and Composition in the Book of Qohelet," *HUCA* 48 (1977) 83-106, esp. 92-93, citing *Kagemni, The Prophecy of Neferti*, and *Onchsheshonqy*. Fox also takes Qoh 12:9-13 to be a closing narrative which serves to legitimate the words of the sage (101). To this can be added that near the opening of Qohelet (1:12-13) appears the claim to Solomonic authorship and a correlative claim to wisdom which serves to credential the speeches which follow (Crenshaw, "Sapiential Rhetoric," 29, note 48). *Ps. Phoc.* 1-2 credentials the sage ("wisest of men") and promises blessing, and the closing lines (228-230) promise the blessing of a long life to those who follow the instructions, while the closing lines of the *Golden Verses* promise apotheosis. Job prefaces its series of speeches and counter-speeches with a narrative test sequence which features the motifs of devil and Job's faithfulness (Job 1:1-13).

as 'Son of God' is an honor declaration of the highest sort....if his true status is Son of God, his public statements and actions are fully legitimated."⁴⁴²

What spurs this strenuous exercise in legitimation? As we saw in our studies in Q 11, Jesus stands, not in the center as part of the official cult and its apparatus, but on the periphery. He and his wisdom thus lack the conventional means of legitimation and credentialing derived from affiliation with the institutions of official cult and official interpretation of Torah, not to speak of the fact that his wisdom is somewhat unconventional. The Inaugural Discourse responds to this need for alternative legitimation and authorization.⁴⁴³ The Temptation counter-asserts against monopolistic claims of the scribes and Pharisees that Jesus is masterful in the use of sacred text and against the charge of deviancy that Jesus is εὐσεβής, while the Healing establishes Jesus as the broker, or axis, between God and humanity, through whom saving power flows to those who have faith in him.⁴⁴⁴

Though differences of opinion exist within Q scholarship with regard to the redaction history of the Inaugural Sermon (6:20b-49),⁴⁴⁵ there is broad agreement that in its present form the Sermon is an integrated composition.⁴⁴⁶ The Sermon displays fea-

⁴⁴² Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Commentary*, 304. See also Carruth, "Persuasion," 308.

⁴⁴³ Harnack, *Sayings*, 181, note 1; 233, note 1; 235-36, advanced the view that John's Sermon, the Baptism, and the Temptation had a legitimating function vis à vis Jesus' Sermon.

⁴⁴⁴ Fox, "Frame-Narrative," 101, says with regard to the legitimating narrative in Qoh 12:9-13, "The epilogist, speaking in the voice of a conventional wise-man, thus certifies that Qohelet was indeed a wise-man and praises his goals. This testimony is even more necessary in the case of an unconventional, even bizarre, thinker such as Qohelet. Without this mediation the reader's attitude toward the central character could too easily go astray because of that character's deviations from the expected and the proper."

⁴⁴⁵ The IQP includes 6:20a in Q: "And lifting his eyes to his disciples...." However, in the narrative logic of Q, Jesus does not even call disciples until Q 9:57-60. Since both Matthew and Luke, under Markan influence, place their call stories before they introduce their versions of the Q sermon, they naturally have the disciples as part of the audience of Jesus' sermon.

⁴⁴⁶ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 47; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium* 1.365, idem, "Zeugnis," 136-37, Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 372-74; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 55-56; Kosch, *Eschatologische Tora*, 323-24, 402-403, note 981; Kloppenborg, "Response," 209; idem, *Formation*, 171-72, 187-90, Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 157-58; Vaage, "Composite Texts," 75-97; Hoffmann, "Tradition und Situation," 64; idem, "Redaction of Q," 186; Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 122; Catchpole, "Inaugural Discourse," 79-134.

tures of a wisdom composition. We have seen that three serialized instructional speeches make up its bulk. The placing of serialized beatitudes (a formation now attested in a Qumran wisdom text) programmatically at the beginning, and a parable focused on judgment as well as a contrast of the fates of the righteous and wicked at the end, is conventional and frames the three instructions.⁴⁴⁷ The Controversy Discourse is similarly framed by a beatitude (10:23-24) and threats of judgment (11:49-51; 13:35-35). The reference to the Son of Man and the hardships which accompany commitment to him in one framework unit (6:22), balanced by a reference to the sovereign κύριε in the corresponding framework unit (6:46) is replicated in the framework units of the Mission Instruction (9:57-60; 10:21-22). So the Inaugural Sermon belongs securely in the family of the Q macro-instructions, the major difference being that it is nested within a sequence of materials which establish the authoritative credentials of the speaker.

Since three instructions constitute the body of the Inaugural Sermon, the central saying of the middle instruction, "A disciple is not above his teacher, but everyone, when well trained, will be like his teacher" (6:40), is by definition the central saying of both the Inaugural Sermon and the Inaugural Discourse as a whole. We saw that the central sayings of the other three discourses epitomize the rhetorical concerns of the macro compositions in which they are embedded and also succinctly express a change in status. Q 6:40 is no exception. In chapter three it was seen that 6:40 refers to Jesus himself and his competence as a moral guide in contrast to sight-challenged claimants to moral leadership lampooned in 6:39, 41-42. This self-reference relates to the framework sequences in two respects. First, the framework materials establish Jesus' authoritative credentials; here in the center of his inaugural sermon Jesus himself asserts his status as a sage qualified to accept disciples and guide them into wisdom.

⁴⁴⁷ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 186-89, idem, "Social History," 81, Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 21-22, Sevenich-Bax, *Konfrontation*, 378, 391-94, 434, Edwards, *Theology*, 93, Catchpole, "Inaugural Discourse," 80, Grundmann, "Weisheit im Horizont," 191-92, Berger, *Exegese*, 22, Bovon, *Lukas*, 340, Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 95-96, 96, note 85, Zeller, "Grundschrift," 399-400, and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "A Palestinian Collection of Beatitudes," in *Four Gospels*, 1.509-15, esp. 512-13. For a different view see Sato, *Prophetie*, 254; idem, "Wisdom Statements," 140.

The legitimization exercises in the framework lend credibility to this claim. Secondly, the framework materials, particularly the outer units, work out a *synkrisis* of Jesus and John, in which John, though ranked below Jesus, is treated with honor. Here at the center of the discourse (6:39-42) we find another *synkrisis*: 6:40 depicts Jesus with highest honor as the qualified sage while 6:39, 41-42 ridicule the claims of an as yet unspecified group of moral guides and shame them as blind and misguided (see also 7:31-35).

The saying also plays a coordinating role with respect to the Sermon itself, locating its ethic in the sage who is to be emulated.⁴⁴⁸ Q 6:36 recommends the imitation of divine mercy, while 6:40 "recommends imitation of the διδάσκαλος (Jesus) who exemplifies the ethic of non-judgment as well as non-retaliation, love of enemies and startling beneficence."⁴⁴⁹ The requirement of *mimesis* implicit in its invitation anticipates the reference in 6:46-47, 49 to the one "who hears my words and does them."⁴⁵⁰ It also looks back to 6:22-23, where the consequences of commitment to Jesus are spelled out, and further back to the Temptation, whose paraenetic force is predicated upon the expectation recipients will emulate the obedient son of God.⁴⁵¹

Perdue states that "a special form of instruction is the invitation by the sage (or even Wisdom herself) to follow wisdom by pursuing a course of study in a school..."⁴⁵² The central saying of the Inaugural Discourse epitomizes the educative, mimetic ethos of instructional literature and articulates the corresponding protreptic invitation of the sage to the unlearned to acquire wisdom.⁴⁵³ Fiore states, "Ethical-philosophical education involves a

⁴⁴⁸ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 88; Fiore, *Personal Example*, 93. Referring to the "sage" saying in *Ps.-Phoc.* 88, likewise the central gnome of an instructional speech, Wilson states, "Given the sapiential qualities of Pseudo-Phocylides as a whole, the references to wisdom and the wise sage at this pivotal point in the sub-section are both appropriate and effective. The σοφός serves as a paradigm of the ethos that the passage is striving to develop..." (*Love Without Pretence*, 118-19).

⁴⁴⁹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 184-85; see also Carruth, "Persuasion," 308-309.

⁴⁵⁰ See Carruth, "Persuasion," 251.

⁴⁵¹ Carruth, "Persuasion," 309; see also Fiore, *Personal Example*, 49-50.

⁴⁵² Perdue, "Wisdom Sayings," 20, citing *Sir* 6:23-30; 24:19-20; *Prov* 8:32-36.

⁴⁵³ Betz, *Commentary*, 622, states that 6:40 "refers to the general school setting...."

program and looks to intermediate progress as well as to the goal of final perfection....Of course, the initiated need someone to precede them on the path and to point the way to perfection...."⁴⁵⁴ Within the compass of this double-saying Jesus claims the high status of the sage and invites candidates for wisdom to learn from him, promising them that they, "when well trained," will be like the teacher.⁴⁵⁵ The status of being a disciple of a sage itself entails great honor.⁴⁵⁶ Jesus' invitation in 6:40 is hardly different from Sirach's: "Draw near to me, you who are uneducated, and lodge in the house of instruction. Why do you say you are lacking in these things....I opened my mouth and said, 'Acquire wisdom for yourselves without money'" (*Sir* 51:23-25; see also 24:19-24, 30-34).⁴⁵⁷ *Amenemope* 30 promotes its instruction as follows:

Mark for yourself these thirty chapters: They please, they instruct, they are the foremost of all books; they teach the ignorant. If they are read to an ignorant man, he will be purified through them. Seize them; put them in your mind and have men interpret them, explaining them as a teacher. As a scribe who is experienced in his position, he will find himself worthy of being a courtier.

Sirach's invitation and the promise made in *Amenemope* 30 guarantee an elevation in status—from being unlearned to being wise—to those who accept the invitation to follow the instruction and adhere to the sage.⁴⁵⁸ The gnome of 6:40 expresses this educative, invitational ethos of the instructional genre, similarly promises an elevation in status, and appropriately stands like a gateway in the center of Q's threshold discourse.⁴⁵⁹ Its promi-

⁴⁵⁴ Fiore, *Personal Example*, 96, referring to Seneca *Ep* 94.50-51, Pliny, *Ep.* 8.13.1, and others.

⁴⁵⁵ On the status of the sage in ancient Judaism and the educative ideal of transformation through *mimesis* see Martin S. Jaffee, *Early Judaism* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997), esp. 215.

⁴⁵⁶ Jacob Neusner, *Invitation to the Talmud: A Teaching Book*, rev. ed. (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984), 79-80.

⁴⁵⁷ Daniel J. Harrington, "The Wisdom of the Scribe According to Ben Sira," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*, eds. John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg (Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 181-88, esp. 186.

⁴⁵⁸ Leo G. Perdue, "Liminality as a Social Setting for Wisdom Instructions," *JAW* 93 (1981) 114-26, esp. 120, noting the status-elevation function of the Egyptian Instructions.

⁴⁵⁹ See Betz, *Commentary*, 622, 625, Wilson, *Love Without Pretence*, 87 (see also

nent position in the opening discourse makes 6:40 an important genre signalizer. As we saw in chapter one, prominent, exposed positions in a text, such as beginning, end, or transitional points are reserved for genre indicators which signal to recipients how the text is to be understood, processed, and appropriated.⁴⁶⁰ The *Sirach* and *Amenemope* passages cited above place explicit instructional claims at the end of their respective texts (*Sir* 24:19-24, 30-34 is in the center, *Prov* 1:20-33, 8:32-36, Wisdom's invitations, are near the beginning). Q 6:40 is prominently displayed in two respects: it appears in the opening discourse and, moreover, in the heart of that programmatic discourse. Its protreptic invitation, which invokes the socio-cultural sphere of sage, school, and student, signals to the recipients of Q that the text is an instruction, engages their socially and culturally determined expectations with regard to the genre, and hence facilitates their coherent processing of the unfolding text. Correspondingly, it coerces the readers or listeners to enter the world of the text provisionally in the liminal role of student which the text projects upon them.⁴⁶¹ Q 6:40, embedded as it is within the Inaugural Discourse, acts as a gateway into the alternative moral and symbolic universe envisioned and propagated by Q. The credentials of the sage are established, his wisdom is presented succinctly, and the invitation is given. The protreptic invitation of 6:40 thus issued, it is not surprising to see potential disciples approach the sage at the beginning of the next discourse (9:57-60).⁴⁶²

Because of the dominant position occupied by the sapiential Inaugural Sermon within the Inaugural Discourse, few would suggest that the Discourse as a whole is representative of prophetic genres. John's sermon, particularly 3:7-9, though displaying in a

idem, *Mysteries*, 38-39), and Kloppenborg, "Antique Instructional Genres," 154. Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 129, aptly designates the "Feldrede" "protreptische Paränese."

⁴⁶⁰ See Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 130, 175, 212, 260, Lentzen-Deis, "Überlegungen," 14-15, Egger, *Methodenlehre*, 138, and Berger, *Einführung*, 72.

⁴⁶¹ Perdue, "Social Character," 20; see also idem, "Liminality," 118.

⁴⁶² Perdue "Social Character," 14-15 (referring to *Sir* 38:24-39:11; see also idem, *Cult*, 28, on the Egyptian Instructions). Similarly the Jesus of Q introduces his followers to work, a vocation, and a lifestyle suited to that vocation. To be entrusted with delivery of messages was, in fact, part of the job description of the scribe-courtiers to whom the Egyptian Instructions were directed.

concentrated manner prophetic motifs, is characterized by the paraenetic forms of scolding word and admonition, and its "brood of vipers" and skeptical "children of Abraham" epithets can be viewed as upbraiding permutations of the "child" address of wisdom literature. Moreover, John's speech is but one element among several incorporated into an encompassing *synkrisis* of John and Jesus which is not at all prophetic in function. Rather it establishes the high status of Jesus in preparation for the protreptic presentation of his wisdom.

John's sermon strikes themes programmatic both for the Inaugural Discourse and for Q as a whole: the threat of imminent, fiery judgment, the metaphor of the tree and fruit, the announcement of the Coming One, the harvest, and rejection of national privilege.⁴⁶³ The units which follow it—the Temptation and Beatitudes—also anticipate themes sounded in the rest of Q.⁴⁶⁴ Fore-shadowing the thematic interests of a composition in its inaugural units is attested in other ancient literature.⁴⁶⁵ Schmitt notes that in the opening unit of the *Wisdom of Solomon* (1:1-15) "klingt die Thematik kommender Ausführungen an."⁴⁶⁶ Quintilian states with regard to the anticipatory openings of the Homeric epics that Homer "by his statement of the greatness of his themes...excites their [the audience's] attention and renders them receptive by the briefness of his summary" (X.1.48). Anticipatory expression of programmatic themes was singled out by the rhetoricians as

⁴⁶³ For discussion of the programmatic themes struck in John's sermon see Tuckett, "Mark and Q," 171, Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 188, Hoffmann, *Studien*, 33, Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 95, and Cotter, "Function of John," 136-40.

⁴⁶⁴ On the Temptation anticipating themes taken up later in Q see Tuckett, "Temptation Narrative," 479-507, Andreas Lindemann, "Die Versuchungsgeschichte Jesu nach der Logienquelle und das Vaterunser," in *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum: Beiträge zur Verkündigung Jesu und zum Kerygma der Kirche. FS für Willi Marxen zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. Dietrich-Alex Koch, et al. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1989), 91-100, who argues that the Temptation anticipates themes sounded in the Lord's Prayer, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 251-52. For the programmatic nature of the Beatitudes see Hoffmann, *Studien*, 309, and Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 180.

⁴⁶⁵ van Groningen, *Composition*, 68-69. With regard to the first chapter of Isaiah functioning in this manner see Williamson, "Synchronic and Diachronic," 224.

⁴⁶⁶ Schmitt, "Zur dramatischen Form," 247. See also Cotter, "Function of John," 138-40, who likens John's opening speech to the opening monologue of Greek dramas in which dramatic developments to be presented in the play are foreshadowed.

one of the functions of the exordium.⁴⁶⁷ Cicero states, "But the opening passage in a speech must not be drawn from some outside source but from the very heart of the case...." He likens such exordia to the "forecourt or an entrance" of "the mansion or temple to which it belongs" (*de Oratore* II.lxxviii 318-lxxix 320; see also II.lxxx.325).

The Inaugural Discourse superbly fulfills several other functions which the rhetoricians assigned to exordia, in particular, establishing an excellent ethos for the speaker prior to the commencement of the body of the speech. As noted, Q especially faces this problem because Jesus is a parvenu sage located on the periphery, the wisdom he propagates is unconventional, and he is the target of delegitimation and deviance-labeling campaigns by representatives of official wisdom. The pains the Inaugural Discourse gives to the work of legitimation suggests that this was indeed a problematic issue.⁴⁶⁸ In rhetorical situations such as this the task of the exordium is to establish that the speaker is of unimpeachable moral character and is wise and trustworthy.⁴⁶⁹ The Temptation establishes Jesus' εὐσέβεια as well as wisdom and skill with respect to the charter ethical document of Israel.⁴⁷⁰ Jesus' skillful citation of the Torah forges a link between his wisdom and sacred tradition, a factor indispensable for the ancient sage, even one advocating fresh understandings of that tradition. Crenshaw states that the "two essential ingredients of [wisdom] ethos" are "inherited tradition and individual appropriation....personal authority depends upon something which comes as a legacy from the past....In this way individuals point beyond themselves

⁴⁶⁷ Quintilian IV.i.34-35; Aristotle, *Ars Rhetorica* III.14.6-7; *Ad Herennium* I.v.7; see also van Groningen, *Composition*, 63-64.

⁴⁶⁸ Carruth, "Persuasion," 313-14. Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 226, states: "Darauf bezieht sich alles [focus on the person of the rhetor in the exordium], was zum Ziel hat, falsche Anschuldigungen zur erheben oder zurückweisen. Der Verteidiger tut das zu Beginn der Rede, weil er, was ihm im Wege steht, erst entfernen muß, um den Hörer zu gewinnen."

⁴⁶⁹ Quintilian I Pr. 9; III.viii.12-13 ("possessing genuine wisdom and excellence of character"); XII.1, 1, 25-26; Martin, *Antike Rhetorik*, 70, 159, 175, 223; Mack, *Rhetoric*, 35-36; Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.193.

⁴⁷⁰ Quintilian, XII.iii.1-2, states, "Our orator will also require a knowledge of civil law and of the custom and religion of the state....For how will he be able to advise either in public or in private, if he is ignorant of all the main elements that go to make the state?"

to a greater authority...."⁴⁷¹ Jesus' deeds of repulsing Satan and healing the centurion's child attest to his power as well as kindness and generosity: "The *ethe* of the hero is illustrated by his *praxeis*...."⁴⁷² Other parties, namely John and the heavenly voice, testify to him and ascribe him honor.⁴⁷³ A *synkrisis* establishes his preeminence. The compositional connection of 3:21-22 with 7:31-35 in effect depicts Jesus as endowed with *πνεῦμα* and *Σοφία*. With the ethos of its sage established, Q presents his programmatic teaching (6:20b-49), in the middle of which is placed the sage's invitation to come and learn from him.

Summing Up

(1) Q is made up of four discourses, each of which, while making transitional, associative connections with neighboring discourses, displays an internally cohesive macro arrangement of its constituent parts. Germane to each, and lending to each determinative cohesion, is a particular constellation of leading motifs and key-word configurations, and each executes a calculated rhetorical strategy (see below).

(2) Common to all four macro-compositions are these features: (a) *framework* units enacting a reversal of motif; (b) *programmatic threshold* units; (c) a *gnomic or aphoristic pronouncement located in the heart of the composition*, which functions in a coordinating manner within the composition and helps articulate its main elaborative concern. Each of these is a change-of-status saying. This feature can make some claim to be conventional: the *Golden Verses* was seen to be structured around a series of status elevations; *Syriac Menander*, a gnomologium, likewise uses a sequence of references to critical status changes and life-passages to impose a rough outline upon its collection of sayings;⁴⁷⁴ the social function of wis-

⁴⁷¹ Crenshaw, "Sapiential Rhetoric," 19; see also Lang, *Wisdom and the Book of Proverbs*, 37-38.

⁴⁷² Fischel, "Story and History," 446, note 8. Lausberg, *Handbuch*, 1.141, states, "Die Sympathiegewinnung [of the audience for the rhetor] ist gerade für das exordium wichtig."

⁴⁷³ See Cotter, "Function of John," 139-40, and Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 291-92. See also Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Commentary*, 304.

⁴⁷⁴ Alan Kirk, "The Composed Life of the *Syriac Menander*," *SR/SR*, forthcoming.

dom literature is to facilitate status transformations.⁴⁷⁵ (d) Each discourse displays features of the stylistic device *ring composition* which helps integrate multiple constituent units, thereby reinforcing the *Leitmotif* and key word cohesion of the whole. (e) Most importantly, beginning from programmatic opening units and progressing by virtue of significance-laden sequencing of intervening units to culminating final units, each discourse works out a *linear elaboration*. (f) In each case the sequential forward movement articulates a *specific deliberative issue*, and hence, (g) each macro composition executes a *unified (and socially aggressive) rhetorical strategy*. (h) Finally, motifs appearing prominently at the end of one discourse are taken up as major topics by the opening units of the next discourse. This device, which we observed elsewhere, particularly in the *Wisdom of Solomon* (i.e., Wisdom as Salvatrice linking *Wis* 9 and *Wis* 10), links the individual discourses in sequence with one another.

(3) The process of recovering these macro arrangements conforms to the stringent methodological requirements we set out in chapter one. (a) The starting point for analysis in each case is lexical, semantic, and form-critical recurrence. (b) Self-contained, smaller literary units form the constituent building blocks of each; that is, the large compositions conform to the form-critical characteristics of the constituent elements of the text, themselves demarcated on form-critical and genre-critical grounds prior to assertion of any macro-compositional proposals. (c) As noted, each large composition executes a coherent rhetorical strategy, to which each of its constituent units contributes; correspondingly, rhetorically significant relations between constituent units are established by the macro arrangement. (d) With performancial variations the same arrangement is operative in all four discourses. (e) With varying degrees of specificity we found it possible to locate similar compositional patterns with similar constellations of motifs and “emplotments”, executing similar rhetorical strategies in other ancient texts. In at least two cases (Controversy and Mission Discourses) the linear unfolding of the composition appears to utilize scriptural traditions. The Eschatological and Mission Discourses invoke myths with archetypal status to “emplot” their constituent elements. Hence *the composition of the discourses is deeply*

⁴⁷⁵ Perdue, “Liminality,” *passim*.

indebted to literary convention (on this, see below). (f) In the same vein, the Q macro arrangements dovetail to a significant degree with configurations due to the influence of genre, in this case, instruction. This is particularly visible in the placement of programmatic maxims or other instructional forms such as chreias in key threshold positions, the appearance of coordinating and/or epitomizing aphorisms in crux positions, and the use of smaller instructional speeches as major component units of the large compositions. The macro compositions are, in fact, *extended instructional speeches which emulate on a larger scale the arrangement displayed by the smaller Q instructions*. (g) Each macro composition articulates, aggressively and *protreptically*, a set of social interests. Q is a particularistic "boundary" text whose paraenesis functions both to *recruit and resocialize*.

(4) In view of "(f)" above, it is likely that *the same hand(s) as produced the small speeches arranged the large compositions*. This returns us to the question raised at the end of chapter three with regard to whether the twelve serialized instructional speeches might actually be a sapiential *Vorlage* incorporated within an encompassing second redaction. This can now be answered in the negative. Q has no recoverable redaction *history* leading up to the redaction which gave its text the form it presently displays.

(5) Q is a literary achievement comparable (though not equal) to that of the *Wisdom of Solomon*, *Pseudo-Phocylides*, *Sirach*, and the Pythagorean *Golden Verses*. The *Kleinliteratur* model for Q's formation, based on theories of the origins of the synoptic tradition advanced by classical form-criticism, cannot be sustained and should be jettisoned once and for all.

(6) In light of the features of Q composition, the social level of the scribe or scribes who redacted the text should perhaps be estimated a few notches higher than that of the village functionaries postulated by Kloppenborg. This raises the question of the relationship culturally sophisticated scribes, keepers of the Great Tradition, might have to a figure like Jesus and to the Jesus-traditions.

(7) Wisdom forms occupy dominant, defining positions in the macro compositions. Prophetic elements incorporated into the wisdom frameworks function as part of the rhetorical apparatus.

(8) The blurred generic lines among large wisdom genres, the phenomenon of mixed genres, as well as a volatile Hellenistic

environment conducive to emergence of fresh literary combinations make it difficult to come up with a narrow, "pure" genre definition for Q. However, the dominant characteristic of Q is serialization of instructional speeches spoken by an authorized sage treating diverse wisdom topoi within an encompassing text. In this respect it resembles many of the Egyptian Instructions, Prov 1-9, *Golden Verses*, *Sirach*, *Syriac Menander*, and *Pseudo-Phocylides*. The admixture of other genres is particularly characteristic of some of the Egyptian Instructions, Prov 1-9, and *Sirach*. Chreias are an important constituent element of Q, and the influence of chreia collections, with their interest in the *bios* of the sage, may be manifest in the predecessor status given to John. However, the chreias have been absorbed by the instructional framework at the level of both the small instructional speeches and the macro-compositions to such a degree that it is difficult to argue that their presence is evidence of a shift in framework genre. Mixing of genres does not necessitate a redaction-*history* judgment if the genres in question are integrated with respect to each other and to the total textual *Gestalt*.⁴⁷⁶ A different assessment would be justified if the chreia collection, complete with at least some of the dominant characteristics of the genre, appeared to be an *overlay* on a text exhibiting the generic conventions of an Instruction, that is, if there were indications of at least a modicum of compositional incongruity.⁴⁷⁷ One cannot make this argument in the case of Q.

Some scholars are congenitally repelled by ring composition proposals regardless of their warrants, though to be sure, it is not hard to be sympathetic with them. In this respect it is important to emphasize again that Q's macro compositions carry out *primarily linear elaborations* which move forward from programmatic openings incrementally through sequenced units to final culminations. Though in my view ring composition contributes to the enactment of this forward rhetorical movement and to the cohesion of the whole, one can in each case ignore or even choose to reject evidence of ring composition and still have a unified,

⁴⁷⁶ Sellin, "Gattung," 324, discussing the combination of "Wunderheilung" and "Streitgespräch" in Mark 3:1-6. We can note also the mixing of *Lehrgedicht* and *gnomologium* in *Pseudo-Phocylides*.

⁴⁷⁷ Sellin, "Gattung," 324 ("Überlagerung von zwei 'angewandten Formen'...").

self-contained, linear composition to reckon with and appreciate.

Another question inevitably arises: how would Q's simple readers or auditors have recognized these sophisticated compositions? This question is often framed as an objection to the notion that Q displays such, the logic being that if proposed compositional configurations are so sophisticated as to not be obvious in all their technical details to the average first century auditor or reader, then such formations are in fact not a property of the text. When its assumptions are thus exposed, the objection is seen to be without foundation. While a certain amount of *passive* genre competence is necessary if a reader or auditor is to process a text as a communicative artifact, that need not approach the level of *active* genre competence requisite for its production, in our case, that possessed by scribes, the repositories of literacy and literary skill in antiquity.⁴⁷⁸ Nevertheless, some auditors may indeed have recognized and appreciated many compositional attributes of the text, providing it was skillfully performed, presumably by a scribal composer or a member of the literate guild capable of recognizing (perhaps even having produced) the configurations of the text and integrating them into performance.⁴⁷⁹ In antiquity proper recitation of a text was a *bona fide* skill: "Interpretive performance is above all a matter of stress and pitch and timing. But it is also a manner of discerning words and phrasing...."⁴⁸⁰ Moreover, the perceptive abilities of the "simple, unlettered auditor" should not be under-estimated. Textually formative allusions to culturally inculcated motifs and myths, by the very fact of having achieved collective recognition and perhaps archetypal status, would have been anything but obscure to recipients (even though some allusions might be appreciated only by those with a higher level of literary training).⁴⁸¹ As we have seen, Q's text is shot through with conventions of all sorts, the effect of which is to facilitate the junction of the text with readers' (or

⁴⁷⁸ On "aktives und passives Textmusterwissen" see Heinemann & Viehweger, *Textlinguistik*, 169-70, 175.

⁴⁷⁹ An important scribal skill was that the "mouth be skilled in reading" (Brunner, *Altägyptische Erziehung*, 58, citing papyrus remains of scribal instructions).

⁴⁸⁰ Downing, "Word Processing," 35-36.

⁴⁸¹ See Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 101-102, on allusions to Troy in western literature.

auditors') socially and culturally formed expectations and cognitive apparatus.

Compositional and genre configurations function to bestow cohesion and coherence upon a text, thereby enabling it to function communicatively. A reader or auditor can assimilate the significance of a cohesive text and feel its transformative power without necessarily being able—or probably not being able—to give a technical account of the genre and stylistic conventions generative of the text's coherence, effects, and affects. A layperson can appreciate a work of art and be moved by it without being able to discourse—as could a critic or member of the artistic guild—on technical aspects immanent (and obvious to those with trained eyes) in its production. The music analogy adduced by Frye is helpful:

The average audience at a symphony knows very little about sonata form, and misses practically all the subtleties detected by an analysis of the score; yet those subtleties are really there, and as the audience can hear everything that is being played, it gets them all as part of a linear experience; the awareness is less conscious, but not less real.⁴⁸²

The same applies to Q: the cohesion-producing arrangements of traditions at the level of both the small speeches and the macro arrangements enable comprehension and project rhetorical power regardless of whether or not recipients are able to report on the text from a technical perspective. This said, more profound knowledge of the literary configurations of a text enhances one's capacity for understanding and appreciation.

Theories of Q's formation that posit a number of redaction-history layers often appear predicated upon the notion that Q's present text is deficient as regards cohesion. It is those proposing multi-stage redaction histories and who have no trouble calling, for example, Q 7:24-28 a "jumble of alternating statements about John," who need to explain how readers or auditors might have made any sense of the kind of text postulated by such theories.

The same line of argument works against the objection that the textual configurations of Q proposed here are excessively ingenious, or "too good to be true." The precise opposite is the

⁴⁸² Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 85-86; see also pp. 112, 188.

case—the textual configurations proposed here are on virtually all points rather slavishly indebted to convention. Q is hardly an innovative literary achievement. Elaborating a chreia, for example, was a skill developed in the “preliminary exercises.” Not a single compositional procedure or genre feature proposed above lacks attestation elsewhere. Hence all the compositional models employed were available as well-worn conventions to the Q redactor, whose task it was—certainly demanding—to adapt specific materials to those conventions; to be sure, in so doing giving those conventions an individualized impress. In many cases genre, stylistic, and other literary conventions would act virtually as templates, with appropriate traditions needing only to be molded, revised, reformulated, written or rewritten, and slotted into appropriate sequences. What appears to us as complexity in, for example, the composition of the long discourses is actually the result of the application of a few relatively simple organizing techniques.⁴⁸³ So in fact, the textual configurations proposed here for Q do not at all point to an impossibly sophisticated level of composition; to the contrary, they testify to the use of conventions which actually *eased and facilitated redaction*.⁴⁸⁴

Comparative wisdom-genre analysis is a promising avenue for research in Q. For this study we canvassed only a small portion of relevant literature, much of that analysis has been preliminary, yet what was garnered and applied has turned out to be productive for the compositional analysis of Q. Further work along similar lines holds the promise of delivering fresh insights into Q and earliest Christianity.

⁴⁸³ On the organizational and mnemonic techniques operative within the Mishnah, see, for example, Neusner, *Invitation to the Talmud*, 66-68.

⁴⁸⁴ And, it can be added, *reception*. On the highly conventionalized nature of all literary production see Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, 95-103, 132.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient Sources

- Ahiqar*. In *OTP* (1985), 2.494-507. Translated by J. M. Lindenberger.
- Amenemhat*. In William Kelley Simpson, ed. *The Literature of Ancient Egypt. An Anthology of Stories, Instructions and Poetry*, 193-197. 2nd. ed. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Ankhsheshonq*. In Miriam Lichtheim, ed. *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Vol. 3, 159-184. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980.
- Any*. In Miriam Lichtheim, ed. *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Vol. 2, 135-146. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976.
- Aristophanes. *The Frogs*. In *Aristophanes*. 3 Volumes. Translated by Benjamin Bickley Rogers. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Aristotle. *Ars Rhetorica*. Translated by John Henry Freese. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Babrius and Phaedrus*. Translated by Ben Edwin Perry. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Ben Sira*. Translated by Patrick W. Skehan, in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987; NRSV. Greek Text: LXX. Hebrew Text: Francesco Vattioni. *Ecclesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca, latina et siriana*. Napoli: Istituto Orientali di Napoli, 1968.
- Cicero. *de Oratore*. 2 vols. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- . *de Inventione*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- The Cynic Epistles. A Study Edition*. Edited by Abraham J. Malherbe. SBLSPS 12. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Dicta Catonis*. In *Minor Latin Poets*. Vol. 2. Translated by J. W. Duff and A. W. Duff. LCL. Rev. ed. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- 1 Enoch*. In *OTP* (1983), 1.13-89. Translated by E. Isaac.
- Golden Verses*. Text and translation by Johan C. Thom. *The Pythagorean Golden Verses. With Introduction and Commentary*, 94-99. Religions in the Greco-Roman World 123. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Hermogenes. *Progyrnasmata*. In Hock, Ronald F., and Edward N. O'Neil, eds. *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*. Vol 1, *The Progyrnasmata*. SBLTT 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Herodotus. *Histories*. Translated by Thomas A. P. Godey. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Hesiod. *Theogony*. In *Hesiod, Theogony, Works and Days; Theognis, Elegies*. Translated by Dorothea Wender. London: Penguin, 1973.
- . *Works and Days*. In *The Poems of Hesiod*. Translated by R. M. Fraser. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983. Text: *Hesiod Works and Days*.

- Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by M. S. West. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- Isocrates. *Ad Nicoclem*. In *Isocrates*. Vol. 1. Translated by G. Norlin. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928; reprint 1980.
- . *Panathenaeica*. In *Isocrates*. Vol. 2. Translated by G. Norlin. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928; reprint 1980.
- Josephus. *The Life*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956; reprint, 1956, 1976.
- Jubilees*. In *OTP* (1985), 2.52-142. Translated by O. S. Wintermute.
- Kagemni*. In William Kelley Simpson, ed. *The Literature of Ancient Egypt. An Anthology of Stories, Instructions and Poetry*, 177-179. 2nd. ed. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Lucian, *Demonax*. In *Lucian*. Vol. 1. Translated by A. M. Harmon. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913; reprint 1979.
- Merikare*. In William Kelley Simpson, ed. *The Literature of Ancient Egypt. An Anthology of Stories, Instructions and Poetry*, 180-192. 2nd. ed. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Papyrus Insinger*. In Miriam Lichtheim, ed. *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Vol. 3. Translated by Miriam Lichtheim, 184-217. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980.
- Philo. *On the Virtues*. In *Philo*. Vol. VIII. Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Philostratus. *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Translated by F. C. Conybeare. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Pliny. *Letters & Panegyricus*. Translated by Betty Radice. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Pseudo-Isocrates. *Ad Demonium*. In *Isocrates*. Vol. 1. Translated by G. Norlin. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928; reprint 1980.
- Pseudo-Phocylides*. Text and translation by Walter T. Wilson. *The Mysteries of Righteousness: The Literary Composition and Genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 40. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.
- Ptahhotep*. In William Kelly Simpson, ed. *The Literature of Ancient Egypt. An Anthology of Stories, Instructions and Poetry*, 159-176. 2nd. ed. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Quintilian. Translated by H. Butler. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920-1922.
- Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Translated by Harry Caplan. LCL. London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Satire of the Trades*. In Miriam Lichtheim, ed. *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Vol. I, 184-191. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975.
- Sentences of Sextus*. Translated by R. A. Edwards and R. A. Wild. SBLTT 22; Early Christian Literature 5. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981. Text: Henry Chadwick, ed. *The Sentences of Sextus. A Contribution to the History of Early Christian Ethics*. Texts and Studies, n.s. 5. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1959.
- Sentences of the Syriac Menander*. In *OTP* (1985), 2.591-606. Translated by T. Baarda.

- Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. In *OTP* (1983), 1.782-828. Translated by H. C. Kee. Text: M. de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Theognis. *Elegies*. In *Hesiod, Theogony, Works and Days; Theognis, Elegies*. Translated by Dorothea Wender, 89-147. London: Penguin, 1973. Text: Douglas Young, ed. *Theognis*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1971.
- Theon of Alexandria. In Hock, Ronald F., and Edward N. O'Neil, eds. *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*. Vol 1, *The Progymnasmata*. SBLTT 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Wisdom of Solomon*. Translation: NRSV. Text: LXX.

Scholarly Literature

- Abrahams, Roger D. "Genre Theory and Folkloristics." In *Folk Narrative Research*. Edited by Juha Pentikäinen and Tuula Juurikka, 13-19. Studia Fennica: Review of Finnish Linguistics and Ethnology 20. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura; Finnish Literature Society, 1976.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. "Omne Verbum Sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity." *JBL* 109 (1990) 3-27.
- Albertsen, L. L. *Das Lehrgedicht. Eine Geschichte der antikisierenden Sachepik in der neueren deutschen Literatur mit einem unbekannten Gedicht Albrecht von Hallers*. Aarhus: Akademisk Boghandel, 1967.
- Aletti, J. N. "Seduction et Parole en Proverbes I-IX." *VT* 17 (1977) 129-44.
- Alexander, T. Desmond. "Lot's Hospitality: A Clue to His Righteousness." *JBL* 104 (1985) 289-91.
- Allen, Willoughby Charles. "The Book of Sayings Used by the Editor of the First Gospel." In *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Edited by William Sanday, 235-86. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- Alter, Robert. "Sodom as Nexus: the Web of Design in Biblical Narrative." In *The Book and the Text: The Bible and Literary Theory*. Edited by Regina M. Schwartz, 146-60. Cambridge, Mass., and Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Anderson, Stanley E. "Database and Evaluation of Luke 12:35-38." In *Documenta Q*. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- Applebaum, Shimon. "Economic Life in Palestine." In *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Volume Two. CRINT. Edited by S. Safrai et al., 631-700. Amsterdam & Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976.
- Arnal, William. "Database and Evaluation of Luke 12:13-21." In *Documenta Q*. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- . "Redactional Fabrication and Group Legitimation: The Baptist's Preaching in Q (3:7-9, 16-17)." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies On the Sayings Gospel*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 165-80. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Attridge, Harold W. "Reflections on Research into Q." In *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia* 55. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, collab. Leif E. Vaage, 223-34. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Audet, Jean-Paul. "La Sagesse de Ménandre l'Égyptien." *RB* 59 (1952) 55-81.
- Avery-Peck, Alan J. "Rhetorical Argumentation in Early Rabbinic Pronounce-

- ment Stories." In *The Rhetoric of Pronouncement = Semeia* 64. Edited by Vernon K. Robbins, 49-69. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Baarda, T. Introduction to *The Sentences of the Syriac Menander*. OTP. Vol. 2 (1985) 583-590.
- Bacon, B. W. "The Nature and Design of Q, the Second Synoptic Source." *HJ* 22 (1924) 674-88.
- Bal, Mieke. "Experiencing Murder: Ritualistic Interpretation of Ancient Texts." In *Victor Turner and the Construction of Cultural Criticism*. Edited by Kathleen M. Ashley, 3-20. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Bammel, Ernst. "Der Anfang des Spruchbuchs." In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by Camille Focant, 467-75. BETL 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.
- . "Das Ende von Q." In *Verborum Veritas. Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by O. Böcher and K. Haacker, 39-50. Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970.
- Bar-Efrat, S. "Some Observations on the Analysis of Structure in Biblical Narrative." *VT* 30 (1980) 154-73.
- Barns, John. "A New Gnomologium: With Some Remarks On Gnomonic Anthologies." *ClassQ* 44 (1950) 126-37; 45 (1951) 1-19.
- Baumgartner, W. "Die literarischen Gattungen in der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach." *ZAW* 34 (1914) 161-98.
- Beardslee, William A. "Uses of the Proverb in the Synoptic Gospels." *Int* 24 (1970) 61-73.
- Beck, Ingrid. *Die Ringkompositionen bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik*. Spudasmata. Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten 25. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1971.
- Ben-Amos, Dan. "The Concepts of Genre in Folklore." In *Folk Narrative Research*. Edited by Juha Pentikäinen and Tuula Juurikka, 30-43. Studia Fennica: Review of Finnish Linguistics and Ethnology 20. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura; Finnish Literature Society, 1976.
- Berg, Sandra Beth. *The Book of Esther: Motifs, Themes and Structure*. SBLDS 44. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Berger, Klaus. *Einführung in die Formgeschichte*. UTB 1444. Tübingen: Franke, 1987.
- . *Exegese des Neuen Testaments. Neue Wege vom Text zur Auslegung*. UTB 658. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1977.
- . *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984.
- . "Form- und Gattungsgeschichte." *Handbuch religionswissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe*, 2.430-45. Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln: W. Kohlhammer, 1990.
- . "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament." *ANRW* II.25.2. (1984) 1031-432.
- Berger, Peter L. *The Social Reality of Religion*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1973.
- Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1966.
- Berkenkotter, Carol, and Thomas H. Huckin. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995.
- Berlin, Adele. "On the Bible as Literature." *Prooftexts* 2 (1982) 323-27.
- Betz, Hans-Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount. A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49)*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited." *QJS* 45 (1959) 399-408.
- . "The Rhetorical Situation." *PhilRhet* 1 (1968) 1-14.

- Bjorndahl, Sterling. "Database and Evaluation of Q 3:21-22." In *Documenta Q*. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- Black, Clifton C. II. "The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Response to Lawrence Wills." *HTR* 81 (1988) 1-18.
- Blank, Josef. "Zur Christologie Ausgewählter Wunderberichte." In *Schriftauslegung in Theorie und Praxis*, 104-28. München: Kösel, 1969.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT 2.36. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1990.
- Borgen, Peder. *Bread from Heaven. An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. NovTSuppl 10. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Boring, Eugene. *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy and the Gospel Tradition*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.
- Bovon, François. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Vol. 1. EKKNT 3.1. Zurich: Benzinger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989.
- Branham, R. Bracht. "Authorizing Humor: Lucian's Demonax and Cynic Rhetoric." In *The Rhetoric of Pronouncement = Semeia* 64. Edited by Vernon K. Robbins, 33-48. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Braun, Willi. "The Use of Mediterranean Banquet Traditions in Luke 14:1-24." Ph. D. diss., University of Toronto, 1993.
- Breck, John. "Biblical Chiasmus: Exploring Structure for Meaning." *BTB* 17 (1987) 70-74.
- Brinton, Alan. "Situation in the Theory of Rhetoric." *PhilRhet* 14 (1981) 234-48.
- Brunner, Hellmut. *Altägyptische Erziehung*. Weisbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1957.
- . *Altägyptische Weisheit. Lehren für das Leben*. Zürich, München: Artemis, 1988.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. "Chreias in the New Testament." In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joël Delobel, 501-05. BETL 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1982.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Rev. ed. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- . "The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem." *JR* 6 (1926) 337-62.
- . "What the Sayings Source Reveals About the Early Church." In *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited and translated by John S. Kloppenborg, 23-34. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994. Originally published as "Was lässt die Spruchquelle über die Urgemeinde erkennen," *Oldenburgische Kirchenblatt* 19 (1913) 35-37, 41-44.
- Burkert, Walter. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*. Translated by Margaret E. Pinder and Walter Burkert. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- . "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece." In *Temple in Society*. Edited by Michael V. Fox, 27-47. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988.
- Buss, Martin J. "Appropriateness in the Form Criticism of the Teaching Source: A Response to James Williams." In *Genre, Narrativity, and Theology = Semeia* 43. Edited by Mary Gerhart and James G. Williams, 115-19. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Bussmann, Wilhelm. *Synoptische Studien*. 2. Heft, *Zur Redenquelle*. Halle [Saale]: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1929.
- Butts, James R. "The Chreia in the Synoptic Gospels." *BTB* 16 (1986) 132-38.

- Cameron, Ron. "What have you come out to see?" Characterizations of John and Jesus in the Gospels." In *The Apocryphal Jesus and Christian Origins = Semeia* 49. Edited by Ron Cameron, 35-69. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Camp, Claudia. *Wisdom and the Feminine in the Book of Proverbs*. Sheffield: Almond; JSOT, 1985.
- Cancik, Hubert. "Bios und Logos. Formengeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Lukians 'Demonax'." In *Markus-Philologie. Historische, literargeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Evangelium*. Edited by Hubert Cancik, 115-130. WUNT 33. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1984.
- Carlston, Charles E. "Proverbs, Maxims, and the Historical Jesus." *JBL* 99 (1980) 87-105.
- . "Wisdom and Eschatology in Q." In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joël Delobel, 101-19. BETL 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1982.
- Carroll, Robert P. "Synchronic Deconstructions of Jeremiah: Diachrony to the Rescue?" In *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor, 39-51. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Carruth, Shawn. "Persuasion in Q: A Rhetorical-critical Study of Q 6:20-49." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1992.
- . "Strategies of Authority: A Rhetorical Study of the Character of the Speaker in Q 6:20-49." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 98-115. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Catchpole, David R. "The Angelic Son of Man in Luke 12:8." *NovT* 24 (1982) 255-65.
- . "The Beginning of Q: A Proposal." *NTS* 38 (1992) 205-21.
- . "The Centurion's Faith and Its Function in Q." In *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Volume 1. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et al., 518-40. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- . "The Inaugural Discourse." In *The Quest for Q*, 79-134. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.
- . "The Law and the Prophets in Q." In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament. Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for His 60th Birthday*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne with Otto Betz, 95-109. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1987.
- . "The Mission Charge in Q." In *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia* 55. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, collab. Leif E. Vaage, 147-74. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- . "Q and 'The Friend at Midnight' (Luke xi.5-8/9)." *JTS* 34 (1983) 407-24.
- . "Q, Prayer, and the Kingdom: A Rejoinder." *JTS* 40 (1989) 377-88.
- . "The Ravens, the Lilies, and the Q Hypothesis. A Form-critical Perspective on the Source-critical Problem." *SNTU* 6-7 (1981-82) 77-87.
- . "Tradition and Temple." In *The Quest for Q*, 256-79. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.
- . "The Whole People of God." In *The Quest for Q*, 189-200. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Forilegium." *RAC* 7 (1969) 1131-60.
- . *The Sentences of Sextus. A Contribution to the History of Early Christian Ethics*. Texts and Studies, n.s. 5. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1959.

- Clark, David. "Criteria for Identifying Chiasm." *LB* 35 (1975) 63-72.
- Classan, C. Joachim. "St. Paul's Epistles and Ancient Greek and Roman Rhetoric." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament. Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 265-91. JSNTSuppl 90. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- Cobb-Stevens, Veda. "Opposites, Reversals, and Ambiguities: The Unsettled World of Theognis." In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*. Edited by Thomas J. Figueira and Gregory Nagy, 159-75. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Cohn, Robert L. *The Shape of Sacred Space. Four Biblical Studies*. AARSR 23. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings." In *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson, 220-28. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- . "The Son of Man Sayings in the Sayings Source." In *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.* Edited by Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski, 369-89. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
- . "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility." In *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*. Edited by Leo G. Perdue, et al., 165-85. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- Conley, Thomas M. "The Enthymeme in Perspective." *QJS* 70 (1984) 168-87.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Cotter, Wendy. "The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven: Their Function in the Earliest Stratum of Q." *TJT* 8 (1992) 38-51.
- . "'Yes, I tell you, and more than a prophet.' The Function of John in Q." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 135-50. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Cotterell, Peter, and Max Turner. *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*. London: SPCK, 1989.
- Crenshaw, James L. "The Influence of the Wise upon Amos. The 'Doxologies of Amos' and Job 5:9-16; 9:5-10." *ZAW* 79 (1967) 42-52.
- . "Wisdom and Authority: Sapiential Rhetoric and Its Warrants." In *Congress Volume, Vienna, 1980*. Edited by J. A. Emerton, 10-29. VTSuppl 32. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991.
- . *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983.
- Daube, David. "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric." *HUCA* 22 (1949) 239-65.
- Davis, Philip, and John Rogerson. *The Old Testament World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Davis, Winston. "Temples and Shrines in Japan: Their Social Functions." In *Temple In Society*. Edited by Michael V. Fox, 83-103. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988.
- de Beaugrande, Robert-Alain, and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler. *Einführung in die*

- Textlinguistik. Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft* 28. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1981.
- de Buck, A. "La composition littéraire des enseignements d'Amenemhat." *Muséon* 59 (1946) 183-200.
- Derron, Pascale. *Pseudo-Phocylide Sentences*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1986.
- deSilva, David. "Despising Shame: A Cultural-Anthropological Investigation of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *JBL* 113 (1994) 439-61.
- Deutsch, Celia. *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke. Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25-30*. JSNTSuppl 18. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Dewey, Joanna. "Oral Methods of Structuring Narrative in Mark." *Int* 43 (1989) 32-44.
- Di Lella, Alexander A, introduction and commentary, and Patrick W. Skehan, translator. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Di Marco, Angelico-Salvatore. "Rhetoric and Hermeneutic—on a Rhetorical Pattern: Chiasmus and Circularity." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 479-91. JSNTSuppl 90. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by B. L. Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- Dihle, Albrecht. "Goldene Regel." *RAC* 11 (1981) 930-40.
- Dillon, Richard J. "Ravens, Lilies, and the Kingdom of God (Matthew 6:25-33/Luke 12:22-31)." *CBQ* 53 (1991) 605-27.
- Dormeyer, Detlev. *Das Neue Testament im Rahmen der Antiken Literaturgeschichte: Eine Einführung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993.
- Douglas, Rees Conrad. "Family, Power, Religion: A Discussion of the Background and Functions of References to God as Father in the Gospel of Matthew." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1990.
- . "‘Love Your Enemies’: Rhetoric, Tradents, and Ethos." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 116-31. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger. An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Downing, F. Gerald. "A Genre for Q and a Socio-Cultural Context of Q: Comparing Sets of Similarities with Sets of Differences." *JSNT* 55 (1994) 3-26.
- . "Quite Like Q. A Genre for 'Q': The 'Lives' of Cynic Philosophers." *Bib* 69 (1988) 196-225.
- . "Word Processing in the Ancient World: The Social Production and Performance of Q." *JSNT* 64 (1996) 29-48.
- Drummond, Andrew. "Early Roman *clientes*." In *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Edited by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, 89-115. Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 1. London & New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Dubrow, Heather. *Genre. The Critical Idiom* 42. London & New York: Methuen, 1982.
- Dupont, Jacques. "Dieu ou Mammon (Mt 6,24; Lc 16,13)." In *Études sur les Évangiles Synoptiques*. Vol 2, 355-92. BETL 70. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1985.
- . "Le Logien de douze Trônes (Mt 19,28; Lc 22,28-30)." *Bib* 45 (1964) 355-92.
- Ebertz, Michael N. *Das Charisma des Gekreuzigten. Zur Soziologie der Jesusbewegung*. WUNT 45. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1987.

- Edmunds, Lowell. "The Genre of Theognidean Poetry." In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*. Edited by Thomas J. Figueira and Gregory Nagy, 96-111. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Edwards, Richard A. *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy, and Wisdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Egger, Wilhelm. *Methodenlehre zum Neuen Testament. Einführung in linguistische und historische-kritische Methoden*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1987.
- Elliot, John H. "Household and Meals vs. Temple Purity Replication Patterns in Luke-Acts." *BTB* 21 (1991) 102-08.
- . "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions." In *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 211-40. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. *Linguistic Stylistics*. The Hague; Paris: Mouton, 1973.
- Erren, Manfred. "Die Anredestruktur im archaischen Lehrgedicht." In *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*. Edited by Wolfgang Kullmann and Michael Reichel, 186-97. Scripta Oralía 30 A.9. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1990.
- Evans, Craig A. "Opposition to the Temple: Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, 235-53. New York, London: Doubleday, 1992.
- Fairchild, Mark Robin. "Eschatology in the Q Source." Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1989.
- Feinman, Gary M. "Mesoamerican Temples." In *Temple in Society*. Edited by Michael V. Fox, 67-82. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988.
- Fiore, Benjamin. *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*. AnBib 105. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.
- Fischel, Henry A. "Story and History: Observations on Greco-Roman Rhetoric and Pharisaism." In *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. Edited by Henry A. Fischel, 443-72. New York: KTAV, 1977.
- . "Studies in Cynicism and the Ancient Near East: The Transformation of a *Chria*." In *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, 372-411. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- . "The Uses of Sorites (*Climax, Gradatio*) in the Tannaitic Period." *HUCA* 44 (1973) 119-51.
- . "The Transformation of Wisdom in the World of Midrash." In *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Robert L. Wilken, 67-101. University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 1. Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "A Palestinian Collection of Beatitudes." In *Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Volume 1. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et al., 509-15. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- . *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989.
- Fleddermann, Harry T. "The Cross and Discipleship in Q." In *SBLSP* 27. Edited by David Lull, 472-82. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- . "The End of Q." In *SBLSP* 29. Edited by David J. Lull, 1-10. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- . Review of *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q*, by Arland D. Jacobson. *JBL* 113 (1994) 334-36.
- Focke, Friedrich. "Synkrisis." *Hermes* 58 (1923) 327-68.

- Foley, John Miles. "Words in Tradition, Words in Text: A Response." In *Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature = Semeia* 65. Edited by Joanna Dewey, 169-69. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Foster, George M. "Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good." *AmAnth* 67 (1965) 293-315.
- Fox, Michael V. *Character and Ideology in the Book of Esther*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991.
- . "Frame-Narrative and Composition in the Book of Qoheleth." *HUCA* 48 (1977) 83-106.
- . "The Pedagogy of Proverbs 2." *JBL* 113 (1994) 233-43.
- Frankemölle, Hubert. "Evangelist und Gemeinde. Eine methoden-kritische Besinnung mit Beispielen aus dem Mattäus-evangelium." *Bib* 60 (1979) 153-90.
- Frankenberg, Wilhelm. "Die Schrift des Menander (Land anecd. syr. I. S. 64ff.), ein Produkt der jüdischen Spruchweisheit." *ŽAW* 15 (1895) 226-77.
- Fraser, R. M. *The Poems of Hesiod*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1957; 1991.
- Funk, Robert W. "Unravelling the Jesus Tradition: Criteria and Criticism." *Forum* 5/2 (1989) 31-61.
- Gallant, Thomas W. *Risk and Survival in Ancient Greece. Reconstructing the Rural Domestic Economy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Gammie, John G. "The Hellenization of Jewish Wisdom in the Letter of Aristeas." In *Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 4-12, 1985*. Division A, *The Period of the Bible*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1986, 207-14.
- . "Paraenetic Literature: Toward the Morphology of a Secondary Genre." In *Paraenesis: Act and Form = Semeia* 50. Edited by Leo G. Perdue and John G. Gammie, 41-77. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Garland, David E. *The Intention of Matthew 23*. NovTSuppl 52. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Garnsey, Peter, and Greg Woolf. "Patronage of the Rural Poor in the Roman World." In *Patronage in Ancient Society*. Edited by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, 153-70. Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 1. London & New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Garrett, Susan R. "'Lest the Light in You be Darkness': Luke 11:33-36 and the Question of a Commitment." *JBL* 110 (1991) 93-105.
- Garrison, Roman. *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*. JSNTSuppl 77. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- Garsky, Albrecht, and Christoph Heil. "Database and Evaluation of Luke 12:49." In *Documenta Q*. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- Geiger, Ruthild. *Die Lukanischen Endzeitreden. Studien zur Eschatologie des Lukasevangeliums*. Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII 16. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1973.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4:1-11 & Par). An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash*. ConB. New Testament Series 2. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966.
- Gese, H. "Weisheitsdichtung." *RGG*³ Vol. 6. (1962) 1577-81.
- Gilbert, Maurice. *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse (Sg 13-15)*. AnBib 53. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973.
- . "Le Discours menaçant de Sagesse en Proverbes 1,20-33." In *Storia e*

- Tradizioni di Israele: Scritti in Onore di J. Alberto Soggin.* Edited by Daniele Garrone and Felice Israel, 99-119. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1991.
- . "La structure de la prière de Salomon (Sg 9)." *Bib* 51 (1970) 301-31.
- . "Wisdom Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Edited by Michael E. Stone, 283-324. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Goodman, Martin. "The First Jewish Revolt: Social Conflict and the Problem of Debt." *JJS* 33 (1982) 417-27.
- . *The Ruling Class of Judaea. The Origins of the Jewish Revolt Against Rome A. D. 66-70.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Görler, Woldemar. *MENANΔPOY ΓΝΩΜΑΙ.* Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin, 1963.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement." In *Friends, Followers, and Factions. A Reader in Political Clientelism.* Edited by Steffen W. Schmidt, et al., 28-43. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977.
- Greenwood, David. "Rhetorical Criticism and Formgeschichte: Some Methodological Considerations." *JBL* 89 (1970) 418-26.
- Grossberg, Daniel. "The Disparate Elements of the Inclusio in Psalms." *HAR* 6 (1982) 97-104.
- Grundmann, Walter. "Weisheit im Horizont des Reiches Gottes. Eine Studie zur Verkündigung Jesu nach der Spruchüberlieferung Q." In *Die Kirche des Anfangs.* Edited by Rudolf Schnackenburg, et al., 175-99. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1977.
- Guenther, Heinz O. "Database and Evaluation of Q 17:37b." In *Documenta Q.* Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- . "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for Aramaic Sources: Rethinking Christian Origins." In *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia* 55. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, collab. Leif E. Vaage, 41-76. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Güttgemanns, Erhardt. *Candid Questions Concerning Gospel Form Criticism. A Methodological Sketch of the Fundamental Problematics of Form and Redaction Criticism.* Translated by William G. Doty. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 26. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1979.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. "Die Worte vom Licht Lk 11,33-36." In *Orientierung an Jesus. Zur Theologie der Synoptiker.* Edited by Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Brox and Wilhelm Pesch, 107-38. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1973.
- Halverson, John. "Oral and Written Gospel: A Critique of Werner Kelber." *NTS* 40 (1994) 180-95.
- Hamel, Gildas. *Poverty and Charity in Roman Palestine, First Three Centuries, C. E.* University of California Publications: Near Eastern Studies 23. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989.
- Haran, Menahem. "Temple and Community in Ancient Israel." In *Temple and Society.* Edited by Michael V. Fox, 17-26. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988.
- Hardmeier, Christof. *Texttheorie und biblische Exegese. Zur rhetorischen Funktion der Trauermetaphorik in der Prophetie.* BEvT 79. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1978.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke.* Translated by J. R. Wilkenson. New Testament Studies 2. London: Williams & Norgate; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.
- Harrell, Jackson, and Wil A. Linkugel. "On Rhetorical Genre: An Organizing Perspective." *PhilRhet* 11 (1978) 262-81.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "The Wisdom of the Scribe According to Ben Sira." In

- Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg, 181-88. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Harrington, Hannah K. *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis*. SBLDS 143. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Harvey, John D. "Toward a Degree of Order in Ben Sira's Book." *ZAW* 105 (1993) 52-62.
- Havelock, Eric A. "Oral Composition in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles." *NLH* 16 (1984) 175-97.
- Heil, Christoph. "The Reception of Q in Luke and the Original Order of Q 13-17." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Chicago, November 1994.
- Heinemann, Wolfgang, and Dieter Viehweger. *Textlinguistik: Eine Einführung*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1991.
- Hempfer, Klaus W. *Gattungstheorie. Information und Synthese*. UTB 133. München: Wilhelm Fink, 1973.
- Henderson, Ian H. "Gnomic Quatrains in the Synoptics: An Experiment in Genre Definition." *NTS* 37 (1991) 481-98.
- . "Quintilian and the Progymnasmata." *AntAb* 37 (1991) 82-99.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. Translated by James C. G. Greig. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981.
- . *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 Vols. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen. *Studien zur Israelitischen Spruchweisheit*. WMANT 28. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.
- Hernadi, Paul. *Beyond Genre. New Directions in Literary Classification*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1972.
- Herzog, William R. II. *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1996.
- Hexham, Irving, and Karla Poewe. *New Religions as Global Cultures: Making the Human Sacred*. Boulder: Westview, 1997.
- Hezser, Catherine. "Die Verwendung der hellenistischen Gattung Chrie im frühen Christentum und Judentum." *JSt* 27 (1996) 371-439.
- Hock, Ronald F., and Edward N. O'Neil, eds. *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*. Vol 1, *The Progymnasmata*. SBLTT 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Hoffmann, Paul. "Database and Evaluation of Q 22:28-30." In *Documenta Q*. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- . "Jesu 'Verbot des Sorgens' und seine Nachgeschichte in der synoptischen Überlieferung." In *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum. Beiträge zur Verkündigung Jesu und zum Kerygma der Kirche*. Edited by Dietrich-Alex Koch, et al., 116-41. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1989.
- . "Πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας. Redaktion und Tradition in Lc 13,22-30." *ZNW* 58 (1967) 188-214.
- . "The Redaction of Q and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch." In *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper, 159-98. NovTSuppl 75. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- . *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. 2nd ed. NTAbh 2. Münster: Aschendorff, 1972.
- . "Tradition und Situation. Zur 'Verbindlichkeit' des Gebots der Feindesliebe in der synoptischen Überlieferung und in der gegenwärtigen

- Friedensdiskussion." In *Ethik im Neuen Testament*. Edited by Karl Kertelge, 50-118. Freiburg: Herder, 1984.
- , John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson, eds. *Documenta Q*. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- Hollenbach, Paul W. "Jesus, Demoniacs, and Public Authorities: A Socio-Historical Study." *JAAAR* 49 (1981) 567-88.
- Honko, Laurie. "Genre Theorie Revisited." In *Folk Narrative Research*. Edited by Juha Pentikäinen and Tuula Juurikka. *Studia Fennica: Review of Finnish Linguistics and Ethnology* 20, 20-25. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura; Finnish Literature Society, 1976.
- Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Christentum und Judentum in der Logienquelle." *EvT* 51 (1991) 344-64.
- Horna, Konstantin, and K. von Fritz. "Gnome, Gnomendichtung, Gnomologien." *PW Suppl.* 6 (1935) 74-90.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Galilee: History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity International Press, 1995.
- . "Innovation in Search of Reorientation: New Testament Studies Rediscovering Its Subject Matter." *JAAAR* 62 (1994) 1127-66.
- . "Logoi Propheton? Reflections on the Genre of Q." In *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson, 195-209. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- . "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses." In *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia* 55. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, collab. Leif E. Vaage, 175-209. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- . "Questions about Redactional Strata and Social Relations Reflected in Q." In *SBLSP* 28. Edited by David Lull, 186-203. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 37-52. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity International Press, 1995.
- . *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- . "Wisdom Justified by All Her Children: Examining Allegedly Disparate Traditions in Q." In *SBLSP* 33. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering Jr, 733-51. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Humphrey, Hugh M. "Temptation and Authority: Sapiential Narratives in Q." *BTB* 21 (1991) 43-51.
- Humphries, Michael. "The Kingdom of God in the Q Version of the Beelzebul Controversy." *Forum* 9/1-2 (1993) 121-150.
- Isenberg, Sheldon R. "Power through Temple and Torah in Greco-Roman Palestine." In *Christianity, Judaism, and other Greco-Roman Cults*. Vol. 2, *Early Christianity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, 24-52. *Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity* 12. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- , and Dennis E. Owen. "Bodies, Natural and Contrived: The Work of Mary Douglas." *RelStRev* 3 (1977) 1-16.
- Jacobson, Arland D. "Apocalyptic and the Synoptic Sayings Source Q." In *Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Volume 1. Edited by F. van Segbroeck et al. *BETL* 100, 403-19. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- . *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1992.
- Jaffee, Martin S. *Early Judaism*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997.

- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. Rev. ed. London: SCM, 1971.
- Johnson, Steven R. "Database and Evaluation of Q 13:34-35." In *Documenta Q*. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- Jolliffe, Ronald. "Database and Evaluation of Q 11:39." In *Documenta Q*. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- . "Database and Evaluation of Q 11:52." In *Documenta Q*. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- Jones, A. H. M. *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Joyce, Paul M. "Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives on Ezekiel." In *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor, 115-28. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Jülicher, Adolf, with Erich Fascher. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 7th. ed. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1931.
- . *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by Janet Penrose Ward. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1904.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "Lukas 11,14-28." In *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*. Volume 1. 6th ed., 242-48. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Kayatz, Christa. *Studien zu Proverbien 1-9. Eine form- und motivgeschichtliche Untersuchung unter Einbeziehung ägyptischen Vergleichsmaterials*. WMANT 22. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1966.
- Kelber, Werner H. "From Aphorism to Sayings Gospel and from Parable to Narrative Gospel." *Forum* 1/1 (1985) 23-30.
- . "Jesus and Tradition: Words in Time, Words in Space." In *Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature = Semeia* 65. Edited by Joanna Dewey, 139-68. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- . *The Oral and the Written Gospel. The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Kerschensteiner, Julia. "Zu Aufbau und Gedankenführung von Hesiods Erga." *Hermes* 78-79 (1943-44) 149-91.
- Kessler, Martin. "A Methodological Setting for Rhetorical Criticism." *Semiotics* 4 (1974) 22-36.
- Kikawada, Isaac M. "Some Proposals for the Definition of Rhetorical Criticism." *Semiotics* 5 (1977) 67-91.
- Kilgallen, John. "The Return of the Unclean Spirit (Luke 11,24-26)." *Bib* 74 (1993) 45-59.
- Kim, Myung-Soo. *Die Trägergruppe von Q. Sozialgeschichtliche Forschung zur Q-Überlieferung in den synoptischen Evangelien*. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge aus Europäischen Hochschulen 1/1 Hamburg: Verlag an der Lottbek, 1990.
- Kitchen, Kenneth A. "The Basic Literary Forms and Formulations of Ancient Instructional Writings in Egypt and Western Asia." In *Studien zu Altägyptischen Lebenslehren*. Edited by Erik Horning and Othmar Keel, 235-82. OBO 28. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "Alms, Debt and Divorce: Jesus' Ethics in their Mediterranean Context." *TJT* 6 (1990) 182-200.
- . "Database and Evaluation of Q 11:16, 29-32." In *Documenta Q*. Edited by Paul Hoffmann, John S. Kloppenborg, and James M. Robinson. Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.
- . "City and Wasteland: Narrative World and the Beginning of the Say-

- ings Gospel (Q)." In *How Gospels Begin = Semeia* 52. Edited by Dennis E. Smith, 145-60. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- . "Conflict and Invention: Recent Studies on Q." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 1-14. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- . "'Easter Faith' and the Sayings Gospel Q." In *The Apocryphal Jesus and Christian Origins = Semeia* 49. Edited by Ron Cameron, 71-99. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- . *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- . "The Formation of Q and Antique Instructional Genres." In *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 138-55. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- . "The Formation of Q Revisited: A Response to Richard Horsley." In *SBSLP* 28. Edited by David Lull, 204-15. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . Introduction to *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 1-22. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- . "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q." In *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper, 275-319. NovTSuppl 75. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- . "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People." In *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia* 55. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, collab. Leif E. Vaage, 77-102. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- . "Nomos and Ethos in Q." In *Gospel Origins and Christian Beginnings: In Honor of James M. Robinson*. Edited by James E. Goehring, et al., 35-48. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1990.
- . Preface to *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia* 55. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, collab. Leif E. Vaage, vii-viii. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- . *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes, and Concordance*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988.
- . "The Q Sayings on Anxiety (Q 12:2-7)." *Forum* 5/2 (1989) 83-98.
- . "The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems." In *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by Risto Uro. Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran Julkaisuja; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 63. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, forthcoming.
- . "The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People Behind the Document." *CuRBS* 1 (1993) 9-34.
- . "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q." *HTR* 80 (1987) 287-306.
- . "Tradition and Redaction in the Synoptic Sayings Source." *CBQ* 46 (1984) 434-62.
- , ed. *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity International Press, 1995.
- , ed., collab. Leif E. Vaage. *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia* 55. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- , ed. and trans. *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Knierim, Rolf. "Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered." *Int* 27 (1973) 435-68.
- Knipe, David M. "The Temple in Image and Reality." In *Temple and Society*.

- Edited by Michael V. Fox, 105-138. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1988.
- Knox, Wilfred L. *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*. Vol. 2, *St. Luke & St. Matthew*. Edited by H. Chadwick. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1957.
- Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International; London: SCM, 1990.
- . "GNOMAI DIAPHORAI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity. In James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*, 114-57. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- . "One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels." In James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*, 158-204. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Kolarcik, Michael, S. J. *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1-6: A Study of Literary Structure and Interpretation*. AnBib 127. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.
- Kollmann, Bernd. "Lk 12,35-38—ein Gleichnis der Logienquelle." *ZNW* 81 (1990) 254-61.
- Kosch, Daniel. *Die Eschatologische Tora des Menschensohnes. Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Stellung Jesu zur Tora in Q*. NTOA 12. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- . "Q und Jesus." *BZ* 36 (1992) 30-58.
- . "Q: Rekonstruktion und Interpretation: Eine methodenkritische Hinführung mit einem Exkurs zur Q-Vorlage des Lk." *FZPhTh* 36 (1989) 409-25.
- Kraftchick, Steven J. "Why do the rhetoricians rage?" In *Text and Logos: The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament*. Edited by Theodore W. Jennings, Jr., 55-79. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Krispenz, Jutta. *Spruchkompositionen im Buch Proverbia*. Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII 349. Bern, New York, Paris: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Kroll, Wilhelm. "Lehrgedicht." *PRE* 24 (1925) 1842-57.
- Küchler, Max. *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen. Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens*. OBO 26 Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Kugel, James. "James Kugel Responds." *Prooftexts* 2 (1982) 328-32.
- . "On the Bible and Literary Criticism." *Prooftexts* 1 (1981) 217-36.
- Kumaniecki, Kasimierz. "The Structure of Hesiod's *Works and Days*." *ICSB* 10 (1963) 79-96.
- Lang, Bernhard. *Die weisheitliche Lehrrede. Eine Untersuchung von Sprüche 1-7*. SBS 54. Stuttgart: KBW, 1972.
- . *Wisdom and the Book of Proverbs: A Hebrew Goddess Redefined*. New York: Pilgrim, 1986.
- Laufen, Rudolf. *Die Doppelüberlieferung der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums*. BBB 54. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1980.
- Landwehr, Jürgen. "Textsorten als 'Schlechtes Allgemeines' und der Aufstand der Lyrik. Über ein produktives Mißverständnis der Ästhetik." In *Textsorten und literarische Gattungen. Dokumentation des Germanistentages in Hamburg von 1. bis 4. April 1979*. Vorstand der Vereinigung der deutschen Hochschulgermanisten, 235-49. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1983.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 2 Vols. München: Max Hueber, 1960.
- Lemaire, André. "The Sage in School and Temple." In *The Sage in Israel and*

- the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue, 165-81. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Lentzen-Deis, Fritzleo. "Methodische Überlegungen zur Bestimmung literarischer Gattungen im Neuen Testament." *Bib* 52 (1981) 1-20.
- Lewandowski, Theodor. *Linguistisches Wörterbuch*. 3 vols. 5th ed. UTB 1518. Heidelberg, Wiesbaden: Quelle & Meyer, 1990.
- Lichtenstein, Murray. "Chiasm and Symmetry in Proverbs 31." *CBQ* 44 (1982) 202-11.
- Lichtheim, Miriam. *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. 3 vols. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975-80.
- . *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature in the International Context. A Study of Demotic Instructions*. OBO 52. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- . "Observations on Papyrus Insinger." In *Studien zu Altägyptischen Lebenslehren*. Edited by Erik Horning and Othmar Keel, 283-305. OBO 28. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Lindemann, Andreas. "Die Versuchungsgeschichte Jesu nach der Logienquelle und das Vaterunser." In *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum: Beiträge zur Verkündigung Jesu und zum Kerygma der Kirche*. Edited by Dietrich-Alex Koch, et al., 91-100. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1989.
- Loader, J. A. A. *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish, and Early Christian Traditions*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 1. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1991.
- Löning, Karl. "Die Füchse, die Vögel und der Menschensohn (Mt 8,19f par Lk 9,57f)." In *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus*. Edited by Hubert Frankemölle and Karl Kertelge, 82-102. Freiburg; Basel; Wien: Herder, 1989.
- Lührmann, Dieter. "Liebet eure Feinde (Lk 6,27-36/Mt 5,39-48)." *ZTK* 69 (1972) 412-38.
- . *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. WMANT 33. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Luz, Ulrich. "Die wiederentdeckte Logienquelle." *EvT* 33 (1973) 527-33.
- Mack, Burton. "Elaboration of the Chreia in the Hellenistic School." In Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins. *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 31-67. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1989.
- . *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- . *The Lost Gospel. The Book of Q and Christian Origins*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1993.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Roman Social Relations. 50 B. C. to A. D. 284*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1974.
- MacRae, Donald G. "The Body and Social Metaphor." In *The Body as a Medium of Expression*. Edited by Jonathan Benthall and Ted Polhemus, 59-73. London: Penguin, 1975.
- Maier, Johann. "Self-Definition, Prestige, and Status of Priests Towards the End of the Second Temple Period." *BTB* 23 (1993) 139-50.
- Malina, Bruce J. "Patron and Client: The Analogy Behind Synoptic Theology." *Forum* 4/1 (1988) 2-32.
- Malina, Bruce J. and Jerome H. Neyrey. "Conflict in Luke-Acts: Labelling and Deviance Theory." In *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 97-122. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- . *Calling Jesus Names. The Social Value of Labels in Matthew*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988.

- . "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World." In *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 25-65. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Malina, Bruce J., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Manson, T. W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1949. First published as Part II of *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1937).
- Markert, Ludwig. *Struktur und Bezeichnung des Scheltworts. Eine gattungskritische Studie anhand des Amosbuches*. BZAW 140. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1977.
- Martin, Josef. *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode*. Handbuch der Altertums Wissenschaft II.3. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1974.
- Marwick, M. G. "The Sociology of Sorcery in a Central African Tribe." In *Magic, Witchcraft and Curing*. Edited by John Middleton, 101-126. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1967.
- März, Claus-Peter. "„laßt eure Lampen brennen!“ Studien zur Q-Vorlage von Lk 12,35-14,24. Erfurter Theologische Schriften 20. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1991.
- . "Zur Q-Rezeption in Lk 12,35-13,35 (14,1-24)." In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by Camille Focant, 177-208. BETL 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.
- McBride, William T. "Esther Passes: Chiasm, Lex Talio, and Money in the Book of Esther." In *"Not in Heaven": Coherence and Complexity in Biblical Narrative*. Edited by Jason P. Rosenblatt and Joseph C. Sitterson Jr., 211-23. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- McKane, William. *Proverbs: A New Approach*. The Old Testament Library. London: SCM, 1970.
- McVann, Mark. "One of the Prophets: Matthew's Testing Narrative as a Rite of Passage." *BTB* 23 (1993) 14-20.
- . "Rituals of Status Transformation in Luke-Acts: The Case of Jesus the Prophet." In *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 333-60. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Merkelbach, Reinhold. *Die Hirten des Dionysos*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1988.
- Merklein, Helmut. "Die Einheitlichkeit des ersten Korintherbriefes." *ZNW* 75 (1984) 153-83.
- Metzeltin, Michael. "Dynamics of Cohesion in Lyrical Texts." In *Text and Discourse Connectedness*. Studies in Language Companion Series 16. Edited by Maria-Elisabeth Conte et al., 271-80. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamin, 1989.
- Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *QJS* 70 (1984) 151-67.
- Miller, Robert J. "The Rejection of the Prophets in Q." *JBL* 107 (1988) 225-40.
- Millett, Paul. "Hesiod and his World." *PCambPhS* 210 (New Series 30) (1984) 84-115.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 28. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1991.
- Moessner, David P. *Lord of the Banquet. The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Moffatt, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. 3rd & rev. ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918.
- Moloney, Francis J. "The Reinterpretation of Psalm VIII and the Son of Man Debate." *NTS* 27 (1980-81) 656-72.
- Moxnes, Halvor. *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations*

- in *Luke's Gospel*. Overtures to Biblical Theology 23. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- . "Honor and Shame." *BTB* 23 (1993) 167-76.
- . "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts." In *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 241-68. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- . "The Social Context of Luke's Community." *Int* 48 (1994) 379-89.
- Muilenberg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond." *JBL* 88 (1969) 1-18.
- . "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style." *Congress Volume*, 97-111. VTSuppl 1. Leiden: Brill, 1953.
- Mullins, Terence Y. "Topos as a New Testament Form." *JBL* 99 (1980) 541-47.
- Müller, Hans-Peter. "Formgeschichte/Formenkritik. Altes Testament." *TRE* 11 (1983) 271-285.
- . "Die weisheitliche Lehrerzählung im Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt." *WO* 9 (1977-78) 77-98.
- Murphy, Roland E. "Form Criticism and Wisdom Literature." *CBQ* 31 (1969) 475-83.
- . "Wisdom's Song: Proverbs 1:20-33." *CBQ* 48 (1986) 456-60.
- Neirynck, Frans. "The Minor Agreements and Q." In *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper, 49-72. NovTSuppl 75. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- . "Q: From Source to Gospel." *ETL* 71 (1995) 421-30.
- . "Recent Developments in the Study of Q." In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—the Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joël Delobel, 29-75. BETL 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1982.
- Nel, Philip Johannes. *The Structure and Ethos of the Wisdom Admonitions in Proverbs*. BZAW 158. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*. SJLA 1. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- . "Map Without Territory: Mishnah's System of Sacrifice and Sanctuary." *HR* 19 (1978) 103-27.
- . *Invitation to the Talmud: A Teaching Book*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Newton, Michael. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*. Cambridge, London, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. *2 Peter, Jude*. AB 37C. New York and London: Doubleday, 1993.
- . "The Symbolic Universe of Luke-Acts: 'They turn the world upside down'." In *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 271-304. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. HTS 26. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- . "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity." In *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, and "Others" in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs, 73-91. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.
- . "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion." In *SBLSP* 33. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering, 715-32. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Nicolai, Walter. *Hesiods Erga. Beobachtungen zum Aufbau*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter; Universitätsverlag, 1964.

- Nida, Eugene A and Johannes P. Louw. *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*. SBLRBS 25. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm. *Gesetz und Paränese*. WUNT 2.28. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1987.
- Nierenberg, Jess. "Proverbs in Graffiti: Taunting Traditional Wisdom." *Maledicta* 7 (1983) 41-58.
- Nilsson, Martin P. *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*. Vol. 2, *Die Hellenistische und Römische Zeit*. 2nd. ed. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961.
- Nitzan, Bilhah. *Qumran Prayer and Poetry*. Translated by Jonathan Chipman. STDJ 12. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1994.
- Noble, Paul R. "The Literary Structure of Amos: A Thematic Analysis." *JBL* 114 (1995) 209-26.
- O'Connell, Robert M. "Isaiah XIV 4b-23: Ironic Reversal Through Concentric Structure and Mythic Allusion." *VT* 38 (1988) 407-18.
- Oakman, Douglas E. "The Countryside in Luke-Acts." In *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 151-79. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- . "The Herodian Temple and the Jesus Tradition: An Essay in Conceptual Modelling." Unpublished paper, 1990.
- . *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 8. Lewiston and Queenston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1986.
- . "Cursing Fig Trees and Robbers' Dens: Pronouncement Stories within Social-Systemic Perspective. Mark 11:12-25 and Parallels." In *The Rhetoric of Pronouncement = Semeia* 64. Edited by Vernon K. Robbins, 253-74. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Ong, Walter J., S. J. *Interfaces of the Word. Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Orton, David E. *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*. JSNTSuppl 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Overbeck, Franz. "Über die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur." *HistZeit* 48 (1882) 417-72.
- Overman, J. Andrew. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Parunak, H. van Dyke. "Oral Typesetting: Some Uses of Biblical Structure." *Bib* 62 (1981) 153-68.
- . "Some Axioms for Literary Architecture." *Semiotics* 8 (1982) 1-16.
- Patrick, Dale and Allen Scult. *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation*. JSOTSuppl 82. Bible and Literature Series 26. Sheffield: Almond, 1990.
- Peabody, Berkley. *The Winged Word. A Study in the Technique of Ancient Greek Oral Composition as Seen Principally through Hesiod's Works and Days*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1975.
- Perdue, Leo G. "Liminality as a Social Setting for Wisdom Instructions." *QAW* 93 (1981) 114-26.
- . "The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature." In *Paraenesis: Act and Form = Semeia* 50. Edited by Leo G. Perdue and John J. Gammie, 5-39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- . *Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literatures of Israel and the Ancient Near East*. SBLDS 30. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- . "The Wisdom Sayings of Jesus." *Forum* 2/3 (1986) 3-35.
- Pilch, John J. "Sickness and Healing in Luke-Acts." In *Social World of Luke-Acts:*

- Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 181-209. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Piper, Ronald A. "The Language of Violence and the Aphoristic Sayings in Q: A Study of Q 6:27-36." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 53-72. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- . *Wisdom in the Q-tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- , ed. *The Gospel Behind The Gospels: Current Studies On Q*. NovTSuppl 75. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Plöger, Otto. *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)*. BKAT 17. Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984.
- Polag, Athanasius. *Die Christologie der Logienquelle*. WMANT 45. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977.
- . "The Theological Center of the Sayings Source." In *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Edited by Peter Stuhlmacher, translated by John Vriend, 97-105. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Porter, Stanley E. "The Theoretical Justification for Application of Rhetorical Categories to Pauline Epistolary Literature." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 100-22. JSNT Suppl. 90. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- Race, William H. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Rebera, Basil. "Lexical Cohesion in Ruth: A Sample." In *Perspectives on Language and Text*. Edited by Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing, 123-45. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. "Using Ancient Rhetorical Categories to Interpret Paul's Letters: A Question of Genre." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 292-324. JSNT Suppl. 90. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- Reed, Jonathan. "The Social Map of Q." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 17-36. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Reese, James M. "Plan and Structure in the Book of Wisdom." *CBQ* 27 (1965) 391-99.
- Richter, Wolfgang. *Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft. Entwurf einer alttestamentlichen Literaturtheorie und Methodologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Ricoeur, Paul. "The Golden Rule: Exegetical and Theological Perplexities." *NTS* 36 (1990) 392-97.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "Chreia and Pronouncement Story in the Synoptic Gospels." In Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins. *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 1-29. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1989.
- . "Introduction: Using Rhetorical Discussions of the Chreia to Interpret Pronouncement Stories." In *The Rhetoric of Pronouncement = Semeia* 64. Edited by Vernon K. Robbins, vii-xvii. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- . "The Chreia." In *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*. Edited by David E. Aune, 1-24. SBLBS 21. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- . "Foxes, Birds, Burials and Furrows." In Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins. *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 69-84. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1989.
- . "Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures: A Response." In *Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature = Semeia* 65. Edited by Joanna Dewey, 75-91. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

- . "Picking Up the Fragments: From Crossan's Analysis to Rhetorical Analysis." *Forum* 1/2 (1985) 31-64.
- . "Progymnastic Rhetorical Composition and Pre-Gospel Traditions. A New Approach." In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by Camille Focant, 111-47. BETL 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.
- . "Rhetorical Composition and the Beelzebul Controversy." In Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins. *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, 161-93. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1989.
- Robinson, James M. "Early Collections of Jesus' Sayings." In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—the Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joël Delobel, 389-94. BETL 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1982.
- . "Die Logienquelle: Weisheit oder Prophetie? Anfragen an Migaku Sato, *Q* und *Prophetie*." *EvT* 53 (1993) 367-89.
- . "Jesus as Sophos and Sophia: Wisdom Tradition and the Gospels." In *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*. University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 1. Edited by Robert L. Wilken, 1-16. Notre Dame & London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975.
- . "LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q." In James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*, 71-112. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971, first published as "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q." in *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann*, ed. Erich Dinkler (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1964), 77-96.
- . "On Bridging the Gulf from Q to the Gospel of Thomas (or vice versa)." In *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson Jr., 127-75. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1985.
- . "The Incipit of the Sayings Gospel Q." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 75 (1995) 9-33.
- . "The Q Trajectory: Between John and Matthew Via Jesus." In *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson, 173-94. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- . "The Sayings Gospel Q." In *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Vol. 1. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et. al, 361-88. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- . "The Sayings of Jesus: Q." *Drew Gateway* 54 (1983) 26-37.
- . "The Son of Man in the Sayings Gospel Q." In *Tradition und Translation. Zum Problem der interkulturellen Übersetzbarkeit religiöser Phänomene*. Edited by Christoph Elsas et al., 315-35. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1994.
- , and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Rohde, Joachim. *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*. New ed. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. New Testament Library. London: SCM, 1968.
- Rohrbaugh, Richard L. "The Pre-industrial City in Luke-Acts: Urban Social Relations." In *Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey, 125-49. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Römheld, K. F. D. *Die Weisheitslehre im Alten Orient. Elemente einer Formgeschichte*. Biblische Notizen. Beihefte 4. München: Manfred Görg, 1989.
- Rosenkranz, Bernhard. "Die Struktur der Ps. Isokrateischen Demonicea." *Em* 34 (1966) 95-129.
- Roth, Wolfgang. "On the Gnostic-Discursive Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira." In

- Gnomic Wisdom = Semeia 17*. Edited by John Dominic Crossan, 59-79. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Rudberg, Gunnar. "Zur Diogenes-Tradition." *SO* 14 (1935) 22-43.
- Rylaarsdam, J. Coert. *Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Safrai, S. "The Temple." In *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural, and Religious Life and Institutions*. Volume 2. CRINT. Edited by S. Safrai, et al., 865-907. Amsterdam & Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. "Delegitimation of Leaders in Matthew 23." *CBQ* 54 (1992) 659-80.
- . *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society. A Sociological Approach*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988.
- Saller, Richard P. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge; London; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE*. London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992.
- Sandig, Barbara. "Textsortenbeschreibung unter dem Gesichtspunkt einer linguistischen Pragmatik." In *Textsorten und literarischen Gattungen. Dokumentation des Germanistentages in Hamburg von 1. bis 4. April 1979*. Vorstand der Vereinigung der deutschen Hochschulgermanisten, 91-102. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1983.
- Sato, Migaku. "Q: Prophetie oder Weisheit? Ein Gespräch mit J. M. Robinson." *EvT* 53 (1993) 389-404.
- . *Q und Prophetie*. WUNT 2.29. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1988.
- . "Wisdom Statements in the Sphere of Prophecy." In *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper, 139-58. NovT-Suppl 75. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Sauer, Georg. *Jesus Sirach (Ben Sira)*. JSHRZ III. Güterloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1981.
- Schenk, Wolfgang. *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien: Q-Synopse und Rekonstruktion in deutscher Übersetzung mit kurzen Erläuterungen*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1981.
- . "Die Verwünschung der Küstenorte Q 10,13-15: Zur Funktion der Konkreten Ortsangaben und zur Lokalisierung von Q." In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by Camille Focant, 477-90. BETL 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Communal Meals at Qumran." *RevQ* 10 (1979) 45-56.
- . *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. SBLMS 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Schmidt, Jens-Uwe. *Adressat und Paraineseform. Zur Intention von Hesiods 'Werken und Tagen'*. Hypomnemata 86. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1985.
- Schmitt, Armin. "Zur dramatischen Form von Weisheit 1,1-6,21." *BZ* 37 (1993) 236-58.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Der Eschatologische Abschnitt Lukas 17,20-37." In *Schriften zum Neuen Testament*, 220-43. München: Kösel, 1971.
- Schönle, Volker. *Johannes, Jesus und die Juden. Die theologische Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt. 11*. BBET 17. Frankfurt am Main; Bern: Peter Lang, 1982.

- Schottroff, Luise. "Das Gleichnis vom großen Gastmahl in der Logienquelle." *EvT* 47 (1987) 192-211.
- . "Wanderprophetinnen: Eine feministische Analyse der Logienquelle." *EvT* 51 (1991) 332-44.
- Schroer, Silvia. "Der Geist, die Weisheit und die Taube." *FZPhTh* 33 (1986) 197-225.
- Schulthess, Friedrich. "Die Sprüche des Menander, aus dem Syrischen übersetzt." *ZAW* 32 (1912) 199-224.
- Schulz, Siegfried. *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.
- Schürmann, Heinz. *Das Lukasevangelium*. 2 vols. HTKNT 3/1-2. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1969-1994.
- . "Observations on the Son of Man Title in the Speech Source. Its Occurrence in Closing and Introductory Expressions." In *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited and translated by John S. Kloppenborg, 74-97. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- . "QLk 11,14-36 Kompositionsgeschichtlich befragt." In *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Vol. 1, Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et al., 563-86. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- . "Die Redekomposition wider 'dieses Geschlecht' und seine Führung in der Redenquelle (vgl. Mt 23,1-39 par Lk 11,37-54): Bestand-Akoluthie-Kompositionsformen." *SNTU* 11 (1986) 33-81.
- . "Die Warnung des Lukas vor der Falschlehre in der 'Predigt am Berge' Lk 6,20-49." In *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*, 290-309. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968.
- . "Das Zeugnis der Redenquelle für die Basileia-Verkündigung Jesu." In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joël Delobel, 121-200. BETL 59. Leuven: Leuven University Presse; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1982.
- . "Zur Kompositionsgeschichte der Redenquelle. Beobachtungen an der lukanischen Q-Vorlage." In *Der Treue Gottes Trauen. Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas*. Edited by Claus Bussmann and Walter Radl, 325-42. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1991.
- Schüssler-Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "Jesus - Messenger of Divine Wisdom." *ST* 49 (1995) 231-52.
- Schweinfurth-Walla, Sigrid. *Studien zu den rhetorischen Überzeugungsmitteln bei Cicero und Aristoteles*. Mannheimer Beiträge zur Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 9. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1986.
- Scoralick, Ruth. *Einzelspruch und Sammlung. Komposition im Buch der Sprichwörter Kapitel 10-15*. BZAW 232. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1995.
- Scott, Bernard Brandon. "Blowing in the Wind: A Response." In *Orality and Textuality in Early Christian Literature = Semeia* 65. Edited by Joanna Dewey, 181-91. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- . *Hear Then the Parable. A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Scott, James C. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant. Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Segal, Eliezer. *Case Citation in the Babylonian Talmud. The Evidence of the Tractate Neziqin*. BJS 210. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Seifert, Walter. "Die Funktion von Gattung im Rezeptionsprozeß und im Literaturunterricht." In *Textsorten und literarische Gattungen. Dokumentation des Ger-*

- manistentages in Hamburg von 1. bis 4. April 1979*. Vorstand der Vereinigung der deutschen Hochschulgermanisten, 653-65. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1983.
- Sellin, Gerhard. "'Gattung' und 'Sitz im Leben' auf dem Hintergrund der Problematik von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit synoptischer Erzählungen." *EvT* 50 (1990) 311-31.
- Sellew, Philip. "Argument and Design in the Q Sermon." Paper read at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, November, 1990.
- . "Early Collections of Jesus' Words: The Development of Domincal Discourses." Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1988.
- Seng, Egbert W. "Der reiche Tor: Eine Untersuchung von Lk xii 16-21 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung form- und motivgeschichtlicher Aspekte." *NovT* 20 (1978) 136-55.
- Sevenich-Bax, Elisabeth. *Israels Konfrontation mit dem letzten Boten der Weisheit. Form, Funktion und Interdependenz der Weisheitselemente in der Logienquelle*. MThA 21. Altenberge: Oros, 1993.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1980.
- Shils, Edward. "Center and Periphery." In *Center and Periphery: Essays in Macroscology*, 3-16. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Silberman, Lou H. "Schoolboys and Storytellers: Some Comments on Aphorisms and *Chriae*." In *Kingdom and Children = Semeia* 29. Edited by Daniel Patte, 109-15. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Simpson, William Kelley, ed. *The Literature of Ancient Egypt. An Anthology of Stories, Instructions and Poetry*. 2nd. ed. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Sjoberg, Gideon. *The Preindustrial City: Past and Present*. New York: Free Press; London: Collier-Macmillan, 1965.
- Smith, Dennis E. "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke." *JBL* 106 (1987) 613-38.
- Smith, Mahlon H. "No Place for a Son of Man." *Forum* 4/4 (1988) 83-107.
- Snyman, A. H. "Persuasion in Philippians 4.1-20." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 325-37. JSNTSuppl 90. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- Spronk, K. "Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to the Book of Nahum." In *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor, 159-86. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Stegner, William Richard. "The Ancient Jewish Synagogue Homily." In *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*. Edited by David E. Aune, 51-69. SBLSPS 21. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- . "The Temptation Narrative: A Study in the Use of Scripture by Early Jewish Christians." *BR* 35 (1990) 5-17.
- Steinhauser, Michael G. *Doppelbildworte in den synoptischen Evangelien. Eine form- und traditionskritische Studie*. FzB 44. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1981.
- . "The Sayings on Anxieties: Matt 6:25-34 and Luke 12:22-32." *Forum* 6/1 (1990) 67-69.
- . "The Violence of Occupation: Matthew 5:40-41 and Q." *TJT* 8 (1992) 28-37.
- Steinmetz, Horst. "Historisch-strukturelle Rekurrenz als Gattungs-/Textsortenkriterien." In *Textsorten und literarische Gattungen. Dokumentation des Germanistentages in Hamburg von 1. bis 4. April 1979*. Vorstand der Vereinigung der deutschen Hochschulgermanisten, 66-88. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1983.

- Stock, Augustine. "Chiastic Awareness and Education in Antiquity." *BTB* 14 (1984) 23-27.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: MacMillan, 1924.
- . "The Original Extent of Q." In *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Edited by William Sanday, 185-208. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. SBLMS 20. Cambridge and Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature; Scholars Press, 1974.
- Talstra, Eep. "Deuteronomy 9 and 10: Synchronic and Diachronic Observations." In *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor, 187-210. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *The Sword of His Mouth*. SBL Semeia Suppl. 1. Philadelphia: Fortress; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Theißen, Gerd. *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- . "Jesusbewegung als Charismatische Wertrevolution." *NTS* 35 (1989) 343-60.
- . *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*. Translated by Francis McDonagh. Edited by John Riches. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- . *Social Reality and the Early Christians. Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament*. Translated by Margaret Kroll. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Theobald, Michael. "Der Primat der Synchronie vor der Diachronie als Grundaxiom der Literarkritik. Methodische Erwägungen an Hand von Mk 2,13-17/Mt 9,9-13." *BZ* 22 (1978) 161-86.
- Thom, Johan C. *The Pythagorean Golden Verses. With Introduction and Commentary*. RGRW 123. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Thomas, Johannes. *Der jüdische Phokylides. Formgeschichtliche Zugänge zu Pseudo-Phokylides und Vergleich mit der neutestamentlichen Paränese*. NTOA 23. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Thyen, Hartwig. *Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen Homilie*. FRLANT 47/65. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.
- Tödt, H. E. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM, 1965.
- Tribble, Phyllis. *Rhetorical Criticism. Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- . "Wisdom Builds a Poem: The Architecture of Proverbs 1:20-33." *JBL* 94 (1975) 509-18.
- Trillitzsch, Winfried. *Senecas Beweisführung*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft 37. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1962.
- Tucker, Gene M. "Prophetic Speech." *Int* 32 (1978) 31-45.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "Mark and Q." In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by Camille Focant, 149-75. BETL 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.
- . "On the Stratification of Q: A Response." In *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia* 55. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, collab. Leif E. Vaage, 213-22. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- . "Q, Prayer, and the Kingdom." *JTS* 40 (1989) 367-76.
- . "Q, the Law, and Judaism." In *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of Law in Israel and Early Christianity*. Edited by Barnabas Lindars, 90-102. Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988.

- . "The Temptation Narrative in Q." In *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Vol. 1. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et al., 479-507. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine, 1965.
- Twelftree, Graham H. *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*. WUNT 2/54. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1993.
- Uro, Risto. "John the Baptist and the Jesus Movement: What Does Q Tell Us?" In *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper, 231-57. NovTSuppl 75. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- . *Sheep Among Wolves: A Study of the Mission Instructions of Q*. AASF. Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 47. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1987.
- Vaage Leif E. "More Than a Prophet, and Demon-Possessed: Q and the 'Historical' John." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 181-202. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- . "Composite Texts and Oral Mythology: The Case of the 'Sermon' in Q (6:20-49)." In *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, 75-97. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- . *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus' First Followers According to Q*. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- . "The Son of Man Sayings in Q: Stratigraphical Location and Significance." In *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semeia 55*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, collab. Leif E. Vaage, 103-29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- . "The Woes in Q (and Matthew and Luke): Deciphering the Rhetoric of Criticism." In *SBLSP 27*. Edited by David Lull, 582-601. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- van Iersel, B. M. F. "Concentric Structures in Mark 2,1-3,6 and 3,7-4,1: A Case Study." In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by Camille Focant, 521-30. BETL 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.
- van Groningen, B. A. *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque. Procédés et réalisations*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1960.
- van der Horst, P. W. "Pseudo-Phocylides Revisited." *JSP* 3 (1988) 3-30.
- . *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. SVTP 4. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- . *Les Vers d'Or Pythagoriciens*. Leiden: Brill, 1932.
- van Leeuwen, Raymond C. *Context and Meaning in Proverbs 25-27*. SBSDS 96. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- van Otterlo, W. A. A. *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1944.
- van Wolde, Ellen. "A Text-Semantic Study of the Hebrew Bible, Illustrated with Noah and Job." *JBL* 113 (1994) 19-35.
- Vassiliadis, Petros. "The Nature and Extent of the Q-Document." *NovT* 20 (1978) 49-73.
- . "The Original Order of Q. Some Residual Cases. In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by Joël Delobel, 379-87. BETL 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1982.
- Verdenius, W. J. "Aufbau und Absicht der Erga." In *Hésiode et son Influence*. Edited by Kurt von Fritz, et al., 109-59. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1962.

- von Lips, Hermann. *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament*. WMANT 64. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.
- Walcot, P. "The Composition of the *Works and Days*." *Revue des études grecques* 74 (1961) 1-19.
- . *Hesiod and the Near East*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1966.
- Walter, N. "Jewish-Greek Literature of the Greek Period." In *Cambridge History of Judaism*. Vol 2, *The Hellenistic Age*. Edited by W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein, 385-408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Wanke, Joachim. "'Kommentarworte: Älteste Kommentierungen von Herrenworten.'" *BZ* 24 (1980) 208-33.
- Warmuth, Georg. *Das Mahnwort. Seine Bedeutung für die Verkündigung der vorexilischen Propheten Amos, Hosea, Micha, Jesaja und Jeremia*. BEvT 1. Frankfurt: Peter Lang; Bern: Herbert Lang, 1976.
- Wefelmeier, Carl. *Die Sentenzensammlung der Demonicea*. Athens: Rossolatos, 1962.
- Wegner, Uwe. *Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum*. WUNT 2/14. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1985.
- Welch, John W. Introduction to *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*. Edited by John W. Welch, 9-16. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien*. 2nd. ed. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1911.
- West, M.S. Prolegomena to *Hesiod Works and Days*. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by M. S. West, 1-94. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- . "Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature." *HSClPh* 73 (1969) 113-34.
- Westermann, Claus. *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech*. Translated by Hugh Clayton White. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967. Reprint, Cambridge: Lutterworth; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.
- Whedbee, J. William. *Isaiah and Wisdom*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.
- Whybray, R. N. *The Composition of the Book of Proverbs*. JSOTSuppl 168. Sheffield: JSOT; Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Wilken, Robert L. "Wisdom and Philosophy in Early Christianity." In *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Robert L. Wilken, 143-68. University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 1. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975.
- Williams, James G. "Parable and Chreia: From Q to Narrative Gospel." In *Genre, Narrativity, and Theology = Semeia* 43. Edited by Mary Gerhart and James G. Williams, 85-114. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- . *Those Who Ponder Proverbs. Aphoristic Thinking and Biblical Literature*. Sheffield: Almond, 1981.
- Williams, Ronald J. "Scribal Training in Ancient Egypt." *JAOS* 92 (1972) 214-21.
- Williamson, H. G. M. "Synchronic and Diachronic in Isaian Perspective." In *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Johannes C. De Moor, 211-26. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995.
- Wills, Lawrence. "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity." *HTR* 77 (1984) 277-99.
- Wilson, Walter T. *Love Without Pretence. Romans 12.9-21 and Hellenistic-Jewish Wisdom Literature*. WUNT 2/46. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1991.
- . *The Mysteries of Righteousness: The Literary Composition and Genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 40. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.

- Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 43. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1979.
- Winton, Alan P. *The Proverbs of Jesus: Issues of History and Rhetoric*. JSNTSuppl 35. Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.
- Wischmeyer, Oda. *Die Kultur des Buches Jesus Sirach*. BZNW 77. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 1995.
- Wischmeyer, Oda. "Matthäus 6:25-34 par—Die Spruchreihe vom Sorgen." *ZNW* 85 (1994) 1-22.
- Wolf, Eric R. "Kinship, Friendship, and Patron-Client Relations in Complex Societies." In *Friends, Followers, and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism*. Edited by Steffen W. Schmidt, et al., 167-77. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. *Amos the Prophet. The Man and His Background*. Translated by Foster R. McCurley. Edited by John Reumann. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.
- Wright, Addison G. "The Structure of the Book of Wisdom." *Bib* 48 (1967) 165-84.
- Wright, Benjamin G. *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text*. SBLSCS 26. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm. "Biblical Exegesis in the Light of the History and Historicity of Rhetoric and the Nature of the Rhetoric of Religion." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 492-513. JSNTSuppl. 90. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- York, John O. *The Last Shall Be First. The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke*. JSNTSuppl 46. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- Zeller, Dieter. "Entrückung zur Ankunft als Menschensohn (Lk 13,24f; 11,29f)." In *À Cause de l'Évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O. S. B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire*, 513-30. LD 123. Paris: Cerf, 1985.
- . *Kommentar zur Logienquelle*. SKK, Neues Testament 21. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984.
- . "Redactional Processes and Changing Settings in the Q-Material." In *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited and translated by John S. Kloppenborg, 116-30. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- . "Versuchungen Jesu in der Logienquelle." *TTZ* 89 (1980) 61-73.
- . "Eine Weisheitliche Grundschrift in der Logienquelle?" In *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Vol. 1. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, et al., 389-401. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- . *Die weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern*. FzB 17. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977.
- . "Weisheitliche Überlieferung in der Predigt Jesu." In *Religiöse Grunderfahrungen: Quellen und Gestalten*. Edited by Walter Strolz, 94-111. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1977.
- Zmijewski, Josef. *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas-Evangeliums: Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 21,5-36 und Lk 17,20-37*. BBB 40. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1972.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Albertsen, L. L., 114, n. 112
 Allen, Charles Willoughby, 5, n. 18
 Alter, Robert, 355
 Anderson, Stanley D., 227-28; 256, n. 398
 Attridge, Harold W., 41, n. 151
 Audet, Jean-Paul, 138, n. 179

 Baarda, T., 138, n. 179
 Bacon, B. W., 5, n. 18
 Bammel, Ernst, 18; 387, n. 429
 Baumgartner, W., 143; 276
 Beardslee, William A., 164
 Beck, Ingrid, 267, n. 436
 Beck, Roger, 78, n. 283
 Berger, Klaus, 23; 56; 64-65, n. 246; 75-76; 93, n. 24; 130, n. 165; 181; 187; 265-66, n. 431; 301-2, n. 89; 342, n. 343; 359, n. 320; 360, n. 323; 368; 374, n. 375; 384; 394, n. 459
 Berger, Peter, 357, n. 308
 Berlin, Adele, 83, n. 305
 Betz, Hans-Dieter, 64, n. 245; 160, n. 25; 162, n. 36; 163; 171, n. 77; 200, n. 189; 392, n. 453
 Blank, Josef, 387, n. 431
 Borgen, Peder, 219
 Boring, Eugene, 44-47
 Braun, Willi, 252, ns. 378, 380
 Brunner, Hellmut, 401, n. 479
 Bultmann, Rudolf, 4-9; 158, n. 14; 198, n. 182; 241
 Burkert, Walter, 60, n. 232; 322.

 Cameron, Ron, 312, n. 125; 370, ns. 356, 361
 Cancik, Hubert, 54, n. 210
 Carlston, Charles E., 91, n. 15
 Carruth, Shawn, 158, n. 14; 161; 170, n. 71; 262; 361
 Catchpole, David R., 62, n. 237; 156, n. 8; 161, n. 28; 175, n. 94; 176-77; 179; 216-17; 218, n. 252; 256; 259, n. 406; 260, n. 410; 266-67, n. 435; 337-38; 354; 369; 373, n. 367; 387, n. 427

 Chadwick, Henry, 121, n. 142
 Collins, A. Y., 255
 Collins, John J., 18, n. 70; 41, n. 151; 141, n. 181
 Cotter, Wendy, 395, n. 466
 Crenshaw, James L., 389, n. 441; 396-97
 Crossan, John D., 91, n. 17; 232, n. 308; 234, n. 315; 255; 326, n. 179

 de Buck, A., 91, n. 13
 Derron, Pascale, 116, n. 124; 130, n. 164; 277, n. 14; 306, n. 105
 Dibelius, Martin, 10-11
 Di Lella, Alexander A., 143, 384
 Douglas, Mary, 319, n. 151
 Douglas, Rees Conrad, 57, n. 221; 162-63, n. 37
 Downing, F. Gerald, 29, n. 109; 50; 53-55, n. 214; 401
 Dupont, Jacques, 293, n., 70

 Edwards, Richard A., 17, n. 68; 298, n. 82; 354, n. 293
 Ebertz, Michael, 320, n. 156; 332, n. 205; 308

 Fairchild, Mark Robin, 34, n. 124
 Fiore, Benjamin, 392-93
 Fischel, Henry A., 397
 Fleddermann, Harry T., 30, n. 113
 Focke, Friedrich, 381, n. 401
 Fox, Michael V., 308, n. 111; 389, n. 441; 390, n. 444
 Frankemölle, Hubert, 65, n. 247
 Frankenberg, Wilhelm, 137-38, n. 179; 140, n. 180; 348
 Frye, Northrop, 84, n. 309; 306; 308, n. 114; 355; 402
 Funk, Robert W., 312, n. 125

 Gallant, Thomas W., 271, n. 439
 Gammie, John G., 362
 Garrett, Susan R., 201-2, ns. 194, 198; 328

- Garrison, Roman, 135, n. 175
 Garnsey, Peter, 324
 Garsky, Albrecht, 235, n. 318
 Geiger, Ruthild, 258, n. 403; 263
 Gese, H., 115, n. 117; 149, n. 195; 384, n. 412
 Gilbert, Maurice, 282-84
 Görler, Woldemar, 119
 Grossberg, Daniel, 81
 Guenther, Heinz, 58, n. 226
- Hahn, Ferdinand, 197, n. 177
 Harnack, Adolf, 2-3; 378, n. 386; 390, 443
 Harrell, Jackson, 89
 Harvey, John D., 275
 Havelock, Eric A., 199
 Heil, Christoph, 235, n. 318; 242; 312, n. 125
 Heinemann, Wolfgang, 68, n. 255; 76; 80; 85
 Hempfer, Klaus W., 78, 90
 Henderson, Ian H., 200, n. 189; 202, n. 197; 207, n. 213,
 Hexham, Irving, 357, n. 308
 Hoffmann, Paul, 15-17; 153-54; 215-16; 218, n. 252; 226, n. 288; 241; 247, n. 357; 293; 336; 340, n. 235; 314, n. 238; 343; 372, n. 367; 380, n. 395
 Hollenbach, Paul, 189-90, n. 154
 Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm, 34, n. 124
 Horsley, Richard A., 30, n. 111; 41, ns. 151, 152; 48-49; 178, n. 107; 210, n. 229; 213, n. 239; 236, n. 321; 267, n. 435; 289; 319, n. 151; 332-33.
 Humphries, Michael, 185, ns. 138, 139; 187, n. 144; 189-90, ns. 153, 154; 191, ns. 158, 161; 331, n. 203
- Jacobson, Arland D., 15, n. 61; 27-30; 195; 201, n. 195; 228; 289; 299, n. 83; 309; 338; 372, n. 367
 Jaffee, Martin S., 393, n. 455
 Jeremias, Joachim, 180, n. 117
 Jolliffe, Ronald, 317, n. 145
 Johnson, Steven R., 242, n. 343
 Joyce, Paul M., 29, n. 109
 Jülicher, Adolf, 3-4
- Kayatz, Christa, 94; 95, n. 40; 97, n. 43; 99, n. 47; 100; 179; 349; 362, ns. 326, 328
- Kelber, Werner, 7; 45; 47-48
 Kloppenborg, John S., 2; 10, n. 43; 12, n. 52; 16; 29, n. 111; 32; 34-42; 56; 88-89; 113; 121; 156-57; 161; 180; 185, n. 135; 198, n. 184; 203, n. 200; 205; 206, n. 209; 207, n. 214; 208, n. 217; 209; 210, n. 229; 211, n. 234; 225; 229, n. 297; 233, n. 309; 235-36; 238, 239, n. 334; 241-42; 247, n. 357; 254, n. 387; 255-56; 261, n. 415; 266, n. 435; 289; 299; 302, n. 89; 304, n. 100; 309; 313; 316, n. 143; 317, n. 146; 326, n. 179; 327; 337; 340, n. 235; 347, n. 265; 367, n. 341; 368; 369, n. 353; 372, n. 367; 383; 384, n. 412; 387, n. 429; 392
 Koester, Helmut, 89-90; 249, n. 365
 Kolarcik, Michael, 282; 284-87
 Kollmann, Bernd, 230-31
 Kosch, Daniel, 63, n. 240; 153-55; 163, n. 42; 197, n. 177; 309; 372, n. 367
 Krispenz, Jutta, 349, n. 276
 Küchler, Max, 113; 119, n. 130; 130; 137, n. 179; 141-42, n. 182; 279
 Kugel, James, 83
- Lang, Bernhard, 100, n. 53; 101, n. 56
 Laufen, Rudolf, 184; 197, n. 177; 255-56; 309; 338
 Lausberg, Heinrich, 110, n. 96; 361, n. 324; 374; 397, n. 472
 Lichtheim, Miriam, 95, n. 39; 98-100; 274
 Lindemann, Andreas, 395, n. 464
 Linkugel, Wil A., 89
 Luckmann, Thomas, 357, n. 308
 Lührmann, Dieter, 14-16; 29-30, n. 111; 43; 153; 157; 158, n. 14; 194; 196-97; 204, n. 203; 234, n. 313; 309; 336; 372, n. 367
- Mack, Burton L., 55-58; 111, 219; 222-23; 226, n. 289
 Malina, Bruce J., 329, 389-90
 Manson, T. W., 11, n. 47
 Martin, Josef, 396, n. 468
 Marwick, M. G., 329, n. 196
 März, Claus-Peter, 228-33; 235-39;

- 244; 247, ns. 356, 357; 250, n. 366;
251, ns. 370, 374; 289; 304
McKane, William, 94, n. 34; 104
Mitchell, Margaret M., 60, n. 234
Moessner, David P., 84, n. 309
Moffat, James, 5, n. 18
Moloney, Francis J., 341, n. 240
Moxnes, Halvor, 323, n. 167; 328
Müller, Hans-Peter, 308, n. 115; 384
Mullins, Terence Y., 149, n. 193
- Neiryneck, Franz, 377, n. 382
Neusner, Jacob, 403, n. 483
Neyrey, Jerome H., 320, n. 153
Nickelsburg, George W. E., 41, n. 151;
308
Nicolai, Walter, 115, n. 114
Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm, 276, n. 12;
302, n. 89
Nierenberg, Jess, 164, n. 54
Nilsson, Martin, 58
- Oakman, Douglas, 321, 324
O'Connell, Robert H., 308, n. 113
Overbeck, Franz, 6-7, note 25
- Parunak, H. van Dyke, 377, n. 384
Perdue, Leo G., 91; 146, n. 188; 164,
n. 45; 176; 178, n. 107; 200, n. 189;
318, n. 149; 323, n. 165; 333,
n. 215; 392
Piper, Ronald A., 27, n. 101; 61-62;
156, n. 8; 167, n. 51; 176-77; 182;
200; 202, n. 198; 204-5; 220,
n. 263; 254, n. 389; 301, n. 89
Plöger, Otto, 101
Poewe, Karla, 357, n. 308
Polag, Athanasius, 18-19; 231, n. 302;
309; 347
- Race, William H., 374, 375, n. 377
Rebera, Basil, 81, 83, n. 305
Robbins, Vernon K., 112, n. 101; 186;
196, n. 173; 359, 384
Robinson, James M., 34, n. 125; 50,
n. 189; 52-53, n. 205; 153, n. 2;
158, n. 14; 341, n. 237; 364-65;
369; 380, n. 395; 382-83; 383,
n. 406
Rohde, Joachim, 6
Rohrbaugh, Richard L., 389-90
Römheld, K. F. D., 101, n. 56, 384
- Rosenkranz, Bernhard, 126
Roth, Wolfgang, 146; 275
- Saldarini, Anthony J., 321, n. 159
Sanders, E. P., 320, n. 156; 322,
n. 162
Sato, Migaku, 49-52; 87; 197, n. 177;
205-206, n. 208; 210, n. 229; 231,
n. 303; 261, n. 412; 289; 310; 315;
335; 338; 340, n. 235; 373, n. 367
Schenk, Wolfgang, 197, 210, n. 229;
259, n. 408; 360, n. 323; 372,
n. 367
Schiffman, Lawrence H., 292
Schmidt, Jens-Uwe, 116
Schmithals, Walter, 31-32
Schmitt, Armin, 284-88; 307, 395
Schnackenburg, Rudolf, 261; 266
Schulthess, Friedrich, 138, n. 179
Schönle, Volker, 15, n. 61; 371, n. 366
Schottroff, Luise, 252
Schulz, Siegfried, 11-14; 153; 158,
n. 14; 167, n. 54; 185, n. 136; 191-
93; 227; 336; 372, n. 367; 374,
n. 374
Schürmann, Heinz, 8; 19-24; 155-56;
161; 165-66; 176, n. 101; 178; 180,
n. 117; 183-84; 193-94; 198-99;
200, n. 191; 203-4; 215; 233,
n. 311; 255; 289; 309-10; 336-37;
340, n. 235
Schüssler-Fiorenza, Elisabeth, 65,
n. 246
Segal, Eliezer, 242, n. 344
Sellew, Philip, 269
Sellin, Gerhard, 7, n. 25; 90; 400,
n. 477
Seng, Egbert W., 150, n. 195
Sevenich-Bax, Elisabeth, 62-64; 175,
n. 96; 365; 383
Sheppard, Gerald T., 175, n. 97
Smith, Dennis E., 290
Steinhauser, Michael G., 155, n. 5;
167; 184; 186; 197, n. 176; 342
Streeter, B. H., 10
Stegner, William Richard, 219; 389
- Tannehill, Robert C., 223
Theissen, Gerd, 72, n. 270; 164, n. 45;
357
Thom, Johan C., 127, ns. 155, 156;
128-29, n. 158; 279-81

- Thomas, Johannes, 46; 113, n. 107;
130-131; 134, n. 173; 159-60; 225;
302, n. 89;
Tödt, H. E., 11, n. 44; 198, n. 182
Trillitzsch, Winfried, 104
Tuckett, Christopher M., 30, n. 112;
302, n. 89; 319, n. 151; 373, n. 367;
385, n. 419; 395, n. 464
Turner, Victor, 67

Uro, Risto, 32-34; 310; 343; 368.

Vaage, Leif E., 2; 42-44; 156-57; 271,
n. 438; 319, n. 151; 372, n. 367
van der Horst, P. W., 130
van Groningen, B. A., 80; 126, n. 149
van Leeuwen, Raymond C., 211; 227,
n. 290
van Otterlo, W. A. A., 79-80
van Wolde, Ellen, 83, n. 305
Vassiliadis, Petros, 309, n. 120
Vichweger, Dieter, 68, n. 255; 76; 80;
85
von Lips, Hermann, 200, n. 189; 209;
225; 232, n. 308

Wanke, Joachim, 23, n. 86; 166
Warmuth, Georg, 88
Wefelmeier, Carl, 126
Wellhausen, Julius, 4-5, ns. 16, 17
Wilken, Robert L., 121, n. 142
Williams, James G., 197, n. 177; 211,
n. 233
Williamson, H. G. M., 395, n. 465
Wilson, Walter T., 91; 94, n. 34; 98-
99; 109, n. 92; 113; 121, n. 144;
130; 132-34; 136; 150-51, n. 196;
214; 277-78; 363, n. 331; 392,
n. 448
Winton, Alan P., 359, n. 317
Woolf, Greg, 324
Wright, Benjamin G., 145, n. 187
Whybray, R. N., 104, n. 64

Zeller, Dieter, 24-27; 56; 114, n. 109;
143, n. 185; 158, n. 13; 183, n. 132;
195; 198, n. 184; 206, n. 208; 209;
212, n. 237; 215; 220-23; 225; 289;
314; 336; 344; 359, n. 317; 372,
n. 367; 386, n. 426
Zmijewski, Josef, 256; 267, n. 435

INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

Genesis		Job	
1:1-2:4	377	1:1-13	389, n. 441
18:26	261, n. 415	8:16	162, n. 35
28:10-22	313, n. 130	32:8	379, n. 393
37-42	308		
Exodus		Psalms	
12:11	229	8:1-9	341-42
22:2-3	162, n. 35	29	81
24:1-14	291	32:8	354, n. 293
33:7-11	313, n. 130	33:9	387, n. 431
39:32	313, n. 130	37:2	222, n. 268
40:2, 6, 29	313, n. 130	37:5	225, n. 287
Leviticus		39:4-6	220, n. 261
21:16-24	332	55:23	225, n. 287
Numbers		68:9	162, n. 35
21:29	360, n. 320	90:5-6	222, n. 268
Deuteronomy		102:11	222, n. 268
29:23	354, n. 295	103:13-15	222, n. 268
Judges		Proverbs	
19	355, n. 299	1:8-10	101
Ruth		1:17-19	101
1:1-6	81	1:21-33	92, 362, n. 330., 394
4:13-17	81	2:1	92
1 Samuel		2:1-22	101
3:2-14	313, n. 130	3:1-12	101, 225, n. 287
1 Kings		3:13-20	362, ns. 327, 328
3:5-15	225, n. 287	3:21-35	101
17:17-24	370, n. 358, 387, n. 429	4:1-9	101
2 Kings		4:10-19	101
4:29-31	349, n. 275	4:20-27	101
4:32-37	387, n. 429	5:1-23	101-103
5	370, n. 358	6:20-35	101-102, n. 59., 104
Esther		7:1-27	101-102, n. 60, 104
307-308		8:32-36	362, n. 327, 394
		10:1-5	225
		11:10-11	346, n. 261
		15:1-2	346, n. 261
		16:3	225, n. 287
		16:14	209
		16:18-19	346, n. 261
		25:2-25	227, n. 290

- | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 26:4-5 | 169, n. 69, 211, n. 233 | Lamentations | |
| 31:1-31 | 229-30, 362, n. 327 | 4:11 | 354, n. 295 |
| Qohelet | | Ezekiel | |
| 1:12-13 | 389, n. 441 | 14:44-56 | 354, n. 295 |
| 1:15 | 220, n. 261 | 16:44-56 | 354, ns. 293, 294 |
| 4:1-3 | 162, n. 35 | 24 | 360, n. 320 |
| 4:10 | 335, n. 221 | 28:11-12, 22-23 | 354, n. 293 |
| 6:1 | 162, n. 35 | 44:24 | 291 |
| 6:12 | 220, n. 261 | Daniel | |
| 8:7-8 | 220, n. 261 | 3, 6 | 308 |
| 8:9 | 162, n. 35 | Hosea | |
| 10:4 | 209 | 4:4-10 | 333, n. 214 |
| 10:5 | 162, n. 35 | Joel | |
| 10:16 | 335, n. 221, 360, n. 320 | 4:4-8 | 354, n. 293 |
| 12:9-13 | 389, n. 441, 390, n. 444 | Amos | |
| Isaiah | | 1:9-10 | 354, n. 293 |
| 1:19 | 354, n. 295 | 3:11 | 354, n. 293 |
| 5:6 | 162, n. 35 | 4:11 | 354, n. 295 |
| 6:1-13 | 313, n. 130, 334-35 | 4:7-8 | 162, n. 35 |
| 13:16 | 354, n. 295 | 5:11 | 322 |
| 14:4-23 | 308, n. 113, 352 | 5:21-22 | 322 |
| 21 | 354, n. 293 | Micah | |
| 28:7 | 333, 214 | 3:5, 11 | 333, n. 214 |
| 29:18 | 370, n. 358 | 7:6 | 236, 238 |
| 34:5 | 236, n. 323 | Zechariah | |
| 35:5 | 370, n. 358 | 9:2-4 | 354, n. 293 |
| 40:6-8 | 222, n. 268 | Malachi | |
| 42:7 | 370, n. 358 | 1:6-11 | 320 |
| 55:6-13 | 387, n. 431 | Matthew | |
| 61:1 | 370, n. 358 | 10:19-20 | 214, n. 243 |
| 66:16 | 236, n. 323 | 10:26 | 93 |
| Jeremiah | | Mark | |
| 2:8 | 333, n. 214 | 1:27, 44 | 387, n. 429 |
| 5:4 | 333, n. 214 | 2:5, 9 | 387, n. 429 |
| 7:1-34 | 343, n. 250 | 3:1-6 | 400, n. 476 |
| 8:1-9 | 343, n. 250 | 3:22-27 | 183, 186 |
| 13:27 | 360, n. 320 | 4:22 | 93 |
| 22:15-16 | 291 | 8:38 | 210 |
| 28:2 | 360, n. 320 | 10:17-21 | 227, n. 293 |
| 29 | 354, n. 293 | 13:34-36 | 230 |
| 36:6 | 349, n. 275 | | |
| 48:1 | 360, n. 320 | | |
| 50:27 | 360, n. 320 | | |
| 50:40 | 354, n. 295 | | |
| 51:59-64 | 349, n. 275 | | |

Luke				165-72, 174-75,
1:8-23	313, n. 130			187-88, 218,
5:30, 33	290			233, 263, 268-
9:26	210			70, 391-94
12:16-21	150, n. 195	6:43-45	152, 169, n. 61,	
14:8-9	293		173-176, 188,	
14:15	290		209, 268-70	
17:8	290	6:46-49	51, 152, 248, 341,	
18:1-8	177, n. 106		n. 238, 378,	
			n. 386, 387-88	
Q		7:1-10	55, n. 214, 152,	
3:7-9	3, 27, 29, 50, 64,		365, 386-90	
	152, 235,	7:18-23	7, 27, 39, 43, 50,	
	n. 318, 236,		152, 157,	
	256, n. 398,		n. 11, 189,	
	367-68, 377-78,		264, 365, 370-	
	380, 382-83,		71, 376-78,	
	394-95		380, 382-83,	
3:16-17	3, 27, 29, 50, 64,		389	
	152, 235,	7:24-28	7, 27, 29, n. 111,	
	n. 318, 236,		42-43, 50, 152,	
	256, n. 398,		169, n. 61,	
	364, n. 335,		189, 264, 371-	
	368-69, 378-80,		75, 378-80,	
	382-83, 389		382, 389, 402	
3:21-22	3, 10, 27, 29, 45,	7:31-35	7, 27, 29, n. 111,	
	50, 53-54, 152,		39, 42-44, 50,	
	367, 369, 379-		152, 189, 264,	
	80, 382-83,		290-91, 294,	
	385, 397		n. 72, 317,	
4:1-13	3, 10-11, 30,		344, 375-76,	
	n. 112, 45,		382-83, 385,	
	152, 383-86,		389, 392, 397	
	389, 395-97	9:57-60	29, 32-33, 38, 41-	
6:20b-49	38-40, 42, 152,		43, 50, 152,	
	271, 334, 364-		294, n. 72,	
	65, 385, 388-		336-45, 347,	
	94, 397		354-57, 363,	
6:20-23	40, 51, 152, 291,		380, 391, 394	
	294, n. 72,	10:2-12	32-33, 38, 41-42,	
	341, n. 238,		50, 152, 256,	
	391, 395		290-91, 336-39,	
6:27-35	32, 37, 61, 152-		343-59, 364	
	65, 169,	10:13-15	336-39, 350-54,	
	n. 61, 174,		359-62, 364	
	181, 186, 188,	10:16	336-39, 345-47	
	207, n. 216,	10:21-22	11, 19, 27, 29, 32,	
	218, 224, 268,		33, 42, 65,	
	270		n. 246, 152,	
6:36, 37-42	152, 157, n. 11,		157, n. 11,	
	158, n. 13,		313, n. 128,	

- 314, n. 131,
326, 334, 336-
45, 347, 354-
57, 362, 380,
391,
10:23-24 42, 152, 310, 312-
15, 319, 326-
27, 334-35,
342, 344-46,
359, 362, 391
11:2-13 39, 42, 61-62,
152, 157,
n. 11, 169,
n. 61, 176-82,
187-88, 201,
207, n. 216,
218, 219,
n. 260, 222-23,
268-70, 291,
310, 314-15,
319-20, 324-26,
330, 334, 345,
350, n. 279
11:14-23 5, 7, 42-44, 50,
55, n. 214,
152, 169,
n. 61, 181,
183-92, 211,
218, 233, 260,
264, 268-69,
270, 309, 326-
32, 334-35,
345, 346
11:24-26 5, 42-44, 50, 152,
183-84, 264,
309, 313, 327,
330-32, 345,
354
11:29-35 5, 7, 32, 42, 50,
152, 186, n.
143, 192-203,
211, 218, 237,
260, 264, 268-
70, 289, 309,
326, 327-32,
334-35, 345
11:39-52 3, 11-12, 29,
n. 110, 42-44,
50, 152, 201,
n. 195, 211,
309, 315-27,
330, 335-36,
345, 350, n.
279, 352, 391
12:2-12 32, 38, 42, 50, 61,
152, 157,
n. 11, 169,
n. 61, 203-15,
219, n. 257,
223, 231-33,
250,
n. 368, 260,
264, 268-70,
289-90, 294,
n. 72, 296-98,
301,
n. 89, 305,
309, n. 121,
326-27, 335,
341, n. 238,
342, 359
12:22-31 17, 39, 42, 50, 55,
57, 61, 152,
157, n. 11,
169, n. 61,
206, n. 208,
207, n. 216,
215-27, 268,
270, 291, 296-
98, 312,
n. 126, 335,
346
12:33-34 39, 50, 152, 215,
227, 264, 268-
70, 296
12:35-46 3, 152, 169, n. 61,
227-35, 240,
260-61, 268-70,
290-91, 294,
n. 72, 296,
n. 73, 298-99,
305, 335, 346
12:49, 51,
53-59 235-41, 256,
n. 398, 260,
263, 268, 279,
289, 293, 299-
300, 304, 352
13:18-21 42, 152, 300-4,
312, n. 126
13:24-30; 14:11,
16-24, 26-27;

17:33; 14:34-35	38, 152, 181, 241-55, 260, 265, 268, 270, 289-91, 297, 301, 304-5, 354, 358		296-97, 305, 312, n. 126, 341, n. 238, 342
13:34-35	3, 11, 29, n. 110, 32, 152, 198, n. 182, 211, 241-44, 310, 312-15, 318-19, 326-27, 342, 391	Acts 3:1-10 5:12-18 6:3	330, n. 200 330, n. 200 379, n. 393
15:4-10	7, 152, 169, n. 61	1 Corinthians 1:24, 30	379, n. 393
16:13, 16-18	300-4, 312, n. 125	Philippians 2:8	250
17:1-6	300-4, 312, n. 126	2 Timothy 2:11-13	210
17:23-37	3, 10, 50, 152, 198, n. 182, 235, n. 318, 255-70, 289-91, 294, n. 72, 299-300, 305, 352	James 1:13-17	182
19:12-26	10, 152, 265, 297-300	Revelation 3:5 3:20-21	210 292
22:28-30	18, 152, 290-94,		

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

ISSN 0167-9732

2. STROBEL, A. *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der spätjüdische-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2 ff.* 1961. ISBN 90 04 01582 5
6. *Neotestamentica et Patristica*. Eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht. 1962. ISBN 90 04 01586 8
8. DE MARCO, A.A. *The Tomb of Saint Peter*. A Representative and Annotated Bibliography of the Excavations. 1964. ISBN 90 04 01588 4
10. BORG, P. *Bread from Heaven*. An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo. Photomech. Reprint of the first (1965) edition. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06419 2
13. MOORE, A.L. *The Parousia in the New Testament*. 1966. ISBN 90 04 01593 0
15. QUISP, G. *Makarius, das Thomasevangelium und das Lied von der Perle*. 1967. ISBN 90 04 01595 7
16. PFITZNER, V.C. *Paul and the Agon Motif*. 1967. ISBN 90 04 01596 5
17. BELLINZONI, A. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. 1967. ISBN 90 04 01597 3
18. GUNDRY, R.H. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*. With Special Reference to the Messianistic Hope. Reprint of the first (1967) edition. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04278 4
19. SEVENSTER, J.N. *Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the first Jewish Christians Have Known?* 1968. ISBN 90 04 03090 5
20. BUCHANAN, G.W. *The Consequences of the Covenant*. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01600 7
21. KLIJN, A.F.J. *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*. Part 2: 1949-1969. 1969. ISBN 90 04 01601 5
22. GABOURY, A. *La Structure des Évangiles synoptiques*. La structure-type à l'origine des synoptiques. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01602 3
23. GASTON, L. *No Stone on Another*. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01603 1
24. *Studies in John*. Presented to Professor Dr. J.N. Sevenster on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday. 1970. ISBN 90 04 03091 3
25. STORY, C.I.K. *The Nature of Truth in the 'Gospel of Truth', and in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. A Study of the Pattern of Orthodoxy in the Middle of the Second Christian Century. 1970. ISBN 90 04 01605 8
26. GIBBS, J.G. *Creation and Redemption*. A Study in Pauline Theology. 1971. ISBN 90 04 01606 6
27. MUSSIES, G. *The Morphology of Koine Greek As Used in the Apocalypse of St. John*. A Study in Bilingualism. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02656 8
28. AUNE, D.E. *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity*. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03341 6
29. UNNIK, W.C. VAN. *Sparsa Collecta*. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik Part 1. Evangelia, Paulina, Acta. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03660 1
30. UNNIK, W.C. VAN. *Sparsa Collecta*. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik Part 2. I Peter, Canon, Corpus Hellenisticum, Generalia. 1980. ISBN 90 04 06261 0

31. UNNIK, W.C. VAN. *Sparsa Collecta*. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik Part 3. Patristica, Gnostica, Liturgica. 1983. ISBN 90 04 06262 9
33. AUNE D.E. (ed.) *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature*. Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren. 1972. ISBN 90 04 03504 4
34. HAGNER, D.A. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03636 9
35. GUNTHER, J.J. *St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background*. A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03738 1
36. KLIJN, A.F.J. & G.J. REININK (eds.) *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03763 2
37. REILING, J. *Hermas and Christian Prophecy*. A Study of The Eleventh Mandate. 1973. ISBN 90 04 03771 3
38. DONFRIED, K.P. *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03895 7
39. ROON, A. VAN. *The Authenticity of Ephesians*. 1974. ISBN 90 04 03971 6
40. KEMMLER, D.W. *Faith and Human Reason*. A Study of Paul's Method of Preaching as Illustrated by 1-2 Thessalonians and Acts 17, 2-4. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04209 1
42. PANCARO, S. *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*. The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity According to John. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04309 8
43. CLAVIER, H. *Les variétés de la pensée biblique et le problème de son unité*. Esquisse d'une théologie de la Bible sur les textes originaux et dans leur contexte historique. 1976. ISBN 90 04 04465 5
44. ELLIOTT, J.K.E. (ed.) *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*. Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday. 1976. ISBN 90 04 04386 1
45. PANAGOPOULOS, J. (ed.) *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today*. 1977. ISBN 90 04 04923 1
46. KLIJN, A.F.J. *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature*. 1977. ISBN 90 04 05245 3
47. BAARDA, T., A.F.J. KLIJN & W.C. VAN UNNIK (eds.) *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*. I. *Studia ad Novum Testamentum Praesertim Pertinentia a Sociis Sodalicii Batavi c.n. Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Conventus Anno MCMLXXVI Quintum Lustrum Feliciter Complentis Suscepta*. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05685 8
48. BAARDA, T., A.F.J. KLIJN & W.C. VAN UNNIK (eds.) *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*. II. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05686 6
49. O'BRIEN, P.T. *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*. 1977. ISBN 90 04 05265 8
50. BOUSSET, D.W. *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*. Aufsätze zur Religionsgeschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters. Hrsg. von A.F. Verheule. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05845 1
51. COOK, M.J. *Mark's Treatment of the Jewish Leaders*. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05785 4
52. GARLAND, D.E. *The Intention of Matthew 23*. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05912 1
53. MOXNES, H. *Theology in Conflict*. Studies in Paul's Understanding of God in Romans. 1980. ISBN 90 04 06140 1
55. MENKEN, M.J.J. *Numerical Literary Techniques in John*. The Fourth Evangelist's Use of Numbers of Words and Syllables. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07427 9
56. SKARSAUNE, O. *The Proof From Prophecy*. A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-type, Provenance, Theological Profile. 1987. ISBN 90 04 07468 6

59. WILKINS, M.J. *The Concept of Disciple in Matthew's Gospel, as Reflected in the Use of the Term 'Mathetes'*. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08689 7
60. MILLER, E.L. *Salvation-History in the Prologue of John*. The Significance of John 1:3-4. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08692 7
61. THIELMAN, F. *From Plight to Solution*. A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09176 9
64. STERLING, G.E. *Historiography and Self-Definition*. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09501 2
65. BOTHA, J.E. *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman*. A Speech Act Reading of John 4:1-42. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09505 5
66. KUCK, D.W. *Judgment and Community Conflict*. Paul's Use of Apologetic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09510 1
67. SCHNEIDER, G. *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie*. Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970-1990. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09555 1
68. SEIFRID, M.A. *Justification by Faith*. The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09521 7
69. NEWMAN, C.C. *Paul's Glory-Christology*. Tradition and Rhetoric. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09463 6
70. IRELAND, D.J. *Stewardship and the Kingdom of God*. An Historical, Exegetical, and Contextual Study of the Parable of the Unjust Steward in Luke 16: 1-13. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09600 0
71. ELLIOTT, J.K. *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*. An Edition of C.H. Turner's "Notes on Marcan Usage" together with other comparable studies. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09767 8
72. CHILTON, B. *A Feast of Meanings*. Eucharistic Theologies from Jesus through Johannine Circles. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09949 2
73. GUTHRIE, G.H. *The Structure of Hebrews*. A Text-Linguistic Analysis. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09866 6
74. BORMANN, L., K. DEL TREDICI & A. STANDHARTINGER (eds.) *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World*. Essays Honoring DIETER GEORGI. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10049 0
75. PIPER, R.A. (ed.) *The Gospel Behind the Gospels*. Current Studies on Q. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09737 6
76. PEDERSEN, S. (ed.) *New Directions in Biblical Theology*. Papers of the Aarhus Conference, 16-19 September 1992. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10120 9
77. JEFFORD, C.N. (ed.) *The Didache in Context*. Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10045 8
78. BORMANN, L. *Philippi – Stadt und Christengemeinde zur Zeit des Paulus*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10232 9
79. PETERLIN, D. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church*. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10305 8
80. JONES, I.H. *The Matthean Parables*. A Literary and Historical Commentary. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10181 0
81. GLAD, C.E. *Paul and Philodemus*. Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10067 9
82. FITZGERALD, J.T. (ed.) *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech*. Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10454 2
83. VAN TILBORG, S. *Reading John in Ephesus*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10530 1
84. HOLLEMAN, J. *Resurrection and Parousia*. A Tradition-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10597 2

85. MORITZ, T. *A Profound Mystery*. The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10556 5
86. BORG, P. *Philo of Alexandria - An Exegete for His Time*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10388 0
87. ZWIEP, A.W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10897 1
88. WILSON, W.T. *The Hope of Glory*. Education and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Colossians. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10937 4
89. PETERSEN, W.L., J.S. VOS & H.J. DE JONGE (eds.). *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical*. Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10380 5
90. MALHERBE, A.J., F.W. NORRIS & J.W. THOMPSON (eds.). *The Early Church in Its Context*. Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10832 7
91. KIRK, A. *The Composition of the Sayings Source*. Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11085 2